

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XXII.—OCTOBER, 1880.

THE PETER OF HISTORY AND THE PETER
OF FICTION.

NO character in the New Testament is brought before us in such life-like colours, with all his virtues and faults, as that of Peter. He was frank and transparent, and always gave himself as he was, without any reserve.

We may distinguish three stages in his development. In the Gospels, the human nature of Simon appears most prominent; the Acts unfold the Divine mission of Peter in the founding of the Church, with a temporary relapse at Antioch (recorded by Paul); in his epistles we see the complete triumph of Divine grace. He was the strongest and the weakest of the twelve. He had all the excellences and all the defects of a sanguine temperament, being kind-hearted, quick, ardent, hopeful, impulsive, changeable, and apt to run from one extreme to another. He received from Christ the highest praise, and the severest censure. He was the first to confess Him as the Messiah of God, for which he received his new name of Peter, in prophetic anticipation of his commanding position in Church history; but he was also the first who tried to dissuade Him from entering the path of the cross to the crown, for which he brought upon himself the rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan." The rock of the Church had become a rock of offence, and a stumbling-block. He protested, in presumptive modesty, when Christ would wash his feet; and then, suddenly changing his mind, he wished not his feet only, but his hands and head to be washed. He cut off the ear of Malchus in carnal zeal for his Master, and in a few minutes afterwards forsook Him and fled. He solemnly promised to be faithful to Christ, though all should forsake Him; and yet, in the same night, betrayed him thrice. He was the first to cast off the Jewish prejudices against the unclean heathen, and to fraternise with the Gentile converts at Cæsarea and at Antioch: but he was also the first to withdraw from them in cowardly fear of the narrow-minded Judaisers from Jerusalem,

for which inconsistency he had to submit to a humiliating homily from Paul.

But Peter was as quick in returning to his right position as in turning away from it. He most sincerely loved the Lord from the first, and felt no rest and peace till he found forgiveness. With all his weakness, he was a noble, generous soul, and of the greatest service in the Church. God overruled his very sins and inconsistencies for his humiliation and spiritual progress. And in his epistles we find the mature result of the work of purification, a spirit most humble, meek, gentle, tender, loving, and lovely. Almost every word and incident in the Gospel history connected with Peter, left its impress upon his epistles in the way of humble or thankful reminiscence and allusion. His new name "Rock" appears simply as a "stone" among other living stones in the temple of God built upon Christ, "the chief corner-stone."* His charge to his fellow-presbyters is the same which Christ gave to him after the resurrection, that they should be faithful "shepherds of the flock" under Christ the chief "shepherd and bishop of their souls." The record of his denial of Christ is as prominent in all the four Gospels as Paul's persecution of the Church is in the Acts, and it is most prominent—as it would seem under his own direction—in the Gospel of his pupil and "interpreter" Mark, which alone mentions the two cock-crows, thus doubling the guilt of the denial, and which records Christ's words of censure ("Satan"), but omits Christ's praise ("Rock"). Peter made as little effort to conceal his great sin as Paul. It served as a thorn in his flesh, and the remembrance kept him near the cross; while his recovery from the fall was a standing proof of the power and mercy of Christ, and a perpetual call to gratitude. And to the Christian Church ever since, the double story of Peter's denial and recovery has been an unfailing source of warning and comfort. Having turned again to his Lord, who prayed for him that his faith might not fail, he is still strengthening the brethren.†

As to his official position in the Church, Peter stood from the beginning at the head of the Jewish apostles, not in a partisan sense, but in a large-hearted spirit of moderation and comprehension. He never was a narrow, contracted, exclusive sectarian. After the vision at Joppa, and the conversion of Cornelius, he promptly changed his inherited view of the necessity of circumcision, and openly professed the change at Jerusalem, proclaiming the broad principle "that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him;" and that Jews and Gentiles alike are

* 1 Pet. ii. 4-8.—A striking instance of the impression of Christ's words without a trace of boastfulness and assumption of authority.

† Luke xxii. 31, 32.—Spoken in view of the approaching denial. This is the proper meaning of the passage which has been distorted by the Vatican Council into an argument for papal infallibility. Such application would logically imply also that every Pope must deny Christ, and be converted in order to strengthen the brethren.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

saved only "through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ." He continued to be the head of the Jewish-Christian Church at large, and Paul himself represents him as the first among the three "pillars"—apostles of the circumcision. But he stood mediating between James, who represented the right wing of conservatism, and Paul, who commanded the left wing of the apostolic army. And this is precisely the position which Peter occupies in his epistles, which reproduce, to a great extent, the teaching of both Paul and James, and have therefore the character of a doctrinal Irenicum, as the Acts are a historical Irenicum, without violation of truth or fact.

THE PETER OF FICTION.

No character of the Bible—we may say, no character in all history—has been so much magnified, misrepresented, and misused for doctrinal and hierarchical ends, as the plain fisherman of Galilee who stands at the head of the apostolic college. Among the women of the Bible, the Virgin Mary has undergone a similar transformation for purposes of devotion, and been raised to the dignity of the queen of heaven. Peter as the vicar of Christ, and Mary as the mother of Christ, have in this idealised shape become, and are still, the ruling powers in the polity and worship of the largest branch of Christendom.

In both cases, the work of fiction began among the Judaising heretical sects of the second and third centuries, but was modified and carried forward by the Catholic, especially the Roman Church, in the third and fourth centuries.

1. *The Peter of the Ebionite fiction.* The historical basis is Peter's encounter with Simon Magus in Samaria, Paul's rebuke of Peter at Antioch, and the intense distrust and dislike of the Judaising party to Paul. These three undoubted facts, together with a singular confusion of *Simon Magus* with an old Sabinian deity, *Semo Sanous*, in Rome, furnished the material and prompted the motive to religious tendency-novels, written about and after the middle of the second century by ingenious semi-Gnostic Ebionites, either anonymously or under the fictitious name of Clement of Rome, the reputed successor of Peter. In these productions, Simon Peter appears as the great apostle of truth in conflict with Simon Magus, the pseudo-apostle of falsehood, the father of all heresies, and the Samaritan possessed by a demon; and Peter follows him step by step from Cæsarea Stratonis to Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, Antioch, and Rome, and before the tribunal of Nero, disputing with him and refuting his errors, until at last the impostor, in the daring act of mocking the ascension to heaven, meets a miserable end.

In the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, the name of Simon represents, among other heresies also, the free gospel of Paul, who is assailed as a false apostle and hated rebel against the authority of the Mosaic law. The same charges which the Judaisers brought against Paul, are here brought by Peter against Simon Magus, especially the assertion that one

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

may be saved by grace alone. His boasted vision of Christ, by which he professed to have been converted, is traced to a descriptive vision of the devil. The very words of Paul against Peter at Antioch, that he was "self-condemned" (Gal. ii. 11), are quoted as an accusation against God. In one word, Simon Magus is, in part at least, a malignant Judaizing caricature of the apostle of the Gentiles.

2. *The Peter of the hierarchical fiction.* The orthodox version of the Peter-legend, as we find it partly in patristic notices of Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, and Eusebius, partly in apocryphal productions, retains the general story of a conflict of Peter with Simon Magus in Antioch and Rome, but extracts from it its anti-Pauline poison; associates Paul, at the end of his life, with Peter, as the joint though secondary founder of the Roman Church; and crowns both with the martyr's crown in the Neronian persecution on the same day (the 29th of June), and in the same year, or a year apart, but in different localities, and in a different manner. Peter was crucified like his Master (though head downwards), either on the hill of Janiculum (where the Church S. Pietro in Montorio stands), or more probably on the Vatican (the scene of the Neronian circus and persecution); Paul, being a Roman citizen, was beheaded on the Ostian way, at the Three Fountains (Tre Fontane), outside of the city. They even walked together a part of the Appian Way to the place of execution. Caius (or Gaius), a Roman presbyter at the close of the second century, pointed to their monuments or trophies on the Vatican, and in the Via Ostia. The solemn burial of the remains of Peter in the catacombs of San Sebastian, and of Paul on the Via Ostia, took place 29th June, 258, according to the Kalendarium of the Roman Church from the time of Liberius. A hundred years later, the remains of Peter were permanently transferred to the Basilica of St. Peter on the Vatican, those of Paul to the Basilica of St. Paul (San Paolo fuori le mura) *outside* of the Porta Ostiensis (now Porta San Paolo).

The tradition of a twenty-five years' episcopate in Rome (preceded by a seven years' episcopate in Antioch) cannot be traced beyond the fourth century (Jerome), and arose, as already remarked, from chronological miscalculations in connection with the questionable statement of Justin Martyr concerning the arrival of Simon Magus in Rome under the reign of Claudius (41-54). The "Catalogus Liberianus," the oldest list of Popes (supposed to have been written before 366), extends the pontificate of Peter to twenty-five years, one month, nine days, and puts his death on June 29th, 65 (during the consulate of Nerva and Vestinus), which would date his departure from Jerusalem back to A.D. 40. Eusebius, in his "Greek Chronicle," as far as it is preserved, does not fix the number of years, but says, in his "Church History," that Peter came to Rome in the reign of Claudius to preach against the pestilential errors of Simon Magus. The Armenian translation of his "Chronicle" mentions "twenty" years; Jerome, in his translation, or paraphrase rather, "twenty-five" years, assuming without warrant that Peter left Jerusalem for Antioch

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

and Rome in the second year of Claudius (A.D. 42; compare Acts xii. 17, which would rather point to the year 44), and died in the fourteenth or last year of Nero (68). Among modern Roman Catholic historians, there is no agreement as to the year of Peter's martyrdom: Baronius puts it in 69; Pagi and Alban Butler in 65; Möhler, Gams, and Alzog indefinitely between 66 and 68. In all these cases it must be assumed that the Neronian persecution was continued or renewed after 64, of which we have no historical evidence. It must also be assumed that Peter was conspicuously absent from his flock during most of the time, to superintend the churches in Asia Minor and in Syria, to preside at the Council of Jerusalem, to meet with Paul in Antioch, to travel about with his wife; and that he made very little impression there till 58, and even till 63, when Paul, writing to and from Rome, still entirely ignores him. Thus a chronological error is made to override stubborn facts. The famous saying that "no Pope shall see the (twenty-five) years of Peter," which had hitherto almost the force of law, has been falsified by the thirty-two years' reign of the first infallible Pope, Pius IX. (1846 to 1878).

On this tradition, and on the indisputable pre-eminence of Peter in the Gospels and the Acts, especially the words of Christ to him after the great confession (Matt. xvi. 18), is built the colossal fabric of the Papacy, with all its amazing pretensions to be the legitimate succession of a permanent primacy of honour and supremacy of jurisdiction in the Church of Christ, and, since 1870, with the additional claim of papal infallibility in all official utterances, doctrinal or moral. But the validity of this claim requires the fulfilment of three conditions:—

1. The presence of Peter in Rome. This may be admitted as an historical fact, and I for my part cannot believe it possible that such a rock-firm and world-wide structure as the Papacy could rest on the sand of mere fraud and error. It is the underlying fact which gives to fiction its vitality, and error is dangerous in proportion to the amount of truth which it embodies. But the fact of Peter's presence in Rome, whether for one year or twenty-five, cannot be of such fundamental importance as the Papacy assumes, otherwise we would certainly have some allusion to it in the New Testament. Moreover, even though Peter was in Rome, so was Paul, and shared with him on equal terms the apostolic supervision of the Roman congregations, as is very evident from his Epistle to the Romans.

2. The transferability of Peter's pre-eminence to a successor. This is derived from inference from the words of Christ: "Thou art Rock, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." This passage, recorded only by Matthew, is the exegetical rock of Romanism, and is *more frequently quoted* by popes and Papists than any other passage of the Scriptures. But admitting the reference of *petra* to *Peter*, the significance of this prophetic name evidently points to the peculiar mission of Peter in laying the foundation

of the Church once and for all time to come. He fulfilled it on the day of Pentecost and in the conversion of Cornelius; and in this pioneer work Peter can have no successor, any more than St. Paul in the conversion of the Gentiles, and John in the consolidation of the two branches of the Apostolic Church.

3. The actual transfer of this prerogative of Peter—not to the bishop of Jerusalem, or of Antioch, where he undoubtedly resided—but to the bishop of Rome, a place which he cannot be proved from the New Testament to have ever seen. Of such a transfer, history knows absolutely nothing. Clement, bishop of Rome, who first (about A.D. 95) makes mention of Peter's martyrdom, and Ignatius of Antioch, who, a few years later, alludes to Peter and Paul as exhorting the Romans, have not a word to say about the transfer. The very chronology and succession of the first popes is uncertain.

While the claims of the papacy cannot be proved from what we know of the historical Peter, there are, on the other hand, several undoubted facts in the real history of Peter which bear heavily against those claims, namely:—

(1.) That Peter was married (Matt. viii. 14); took his wife with him on his missionary tours (1 Cor. ix. 5); and, according to a possible interpretation of the "coëlect" (sister), mentions her in his first Epistle (chap. v. 13). Patristic tradition ascribes to him children, or at least a daughter (Petronilla). His wife is said to have suffered martyrdom in Rome before him. What right have the popes, in view of this example, to forbid clerical marriage? We pass by the equally striking contrast between the poverty of Peter, who had no silver nor gold (Acts iii. 6), and the gorgeous display of the triple-crowned papacy in the middle ages and even down to the recent collapse of the temporal power.

(2.) That in the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 1-11) Peter appears simply as the first speaker and debater, not as president and judge (James presided), and assumes no special prerogative, least of all an infallibility of judgment. According to the Vatican theory, the whole question of circumcision ought to have been submitted to Peter rather than to a Council, and the decision ought to have gone out from him rather than from "the apostles, and elders, and brethren" (ver. 23).

(3.) That Peter was openly rebuked for inconsistency by a younger apostle at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11-14). Peter's conduct on that occasion is irreconcilable with his infallibility as to discipline; Paul's conduct is irreconcilable with Peter's alleged supremacy; and the whole scene, though perfectly plain, is so inconvenient to Roman and Romanising views, that it has been variously distorted by Patristic and Jesuit commentators even into a theatrical farce got up by the apostles for the more effectual refutation of the Judaisers!

(4.) That, while the greatest of Popes, from Leo. I. down to Leo. XIII., never cease to speak of their authority over all the bishops

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

and all the Churches, Peter in his speeches in the Acts never does so, and his Epistles, far from assuming any superiority over his "fellow-elders," and over "the clergy" (by which he means the Christian people), breathe the spirit of sincerest humility, and contain a prophetic warning against the besetting sins of the Papacy,—filthy avarice and lordly ambition (1 Peter v. 1-3). Love of money and love of power are twin sisters, and either of them is "a root of all evil."

PHILIP SCHAFF.

JAMES OUTRAM, THE BAYARD OF INDIA.

WHEN Dr. Bisset was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland, he asked the eleventh Earl of Dalhousie, an elder of the Free Church of Scotland, for a note of introduction for a friend, to Lord Elgin, at that time Viceroy and Governor-General of India. "I think your strongest claim on the Indian Government," wrote the Earl, who was then Secretary for War, "is that you have trained such a general and statesman as Outram for the public service, and this I have mentioned to Lord Elgin." When eleven years of age, in 1814, James Outram had been sent to Dr. Bisset's school at Udney, near Aberdeen, where, like the young Clive at Drayton, but without his fierceness, he became famous for deeds of daring and high moral courage. If we except Sir Henry Durand, who outlived him by a few years, James Outram was the last of the great soldier-statesmen of the East India Company, as John Lawrence was of its civilians. He comes next to Henry Lawrence, and second only to him who has been described as probably the greatest Englishman ever sent to India. It is because he showed, with these three, the enduring distinction of being a Christian under all and above all his earthly honours and natural virtues, that it is right in these pages to commend to the study of the Churches the biography, "James Outram," which has just been written, with a soldier's dash and a "political's" experience, by Sir F. J. Goldsmid.*

We do so all the more because the inner Christian life of James Outram found very different modes of expression from theirs. Durand was an officer of such culture that he knew theology, which he used to discuss with his friend Judson, and he made Leighton's writings his constant companion. Henry Lawrence gave himself to Christ when a young lieutenant, and was ever, till he died, as ardent and open an evangelical as Charles Simeon himself. John Lawrence, after the Mutiny had anew revealed him to himself, never hesitated to put Christianity in the front in his most formal official documents. But Outram's hidden life

* James Outram : A Biography. By Major-Gen. Sir F. J. Goldsmid, C.B., K.C.S.I. Two volumes. London : Smith, Elder, & Co., 1880.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

found expression chiefly in grandly Christian deeds, to Protestant and Romanist, to Christian and non-Christian alike. The shyness of reserve, combined with unfamiliarity with the phraseology of religious writings, never allowed him to speak or write publicly like Henry Lawrence, whom, nevertheless, he equalled in the good deeds that he did. At the last only, and when pleading for the highest interests of the private soldier, his wife and children, did the hero's big heart burst forth through his formal minutes, as we shall see, into counsels that a professional chaplain might have given. The most daring of all Anglo-Indian heroes was at once the most cautious of generals and most reserved of Christians. He acted, he lived, as Christ taught, in spite of the temptations of the camp, and the contradiction of meaner souls who often roused his indignation. Had he warred in Pagan times, he would have had the apotheosis of Heracles, whom on his physical side he most closely resembled throughout his career. Had he energised in early Christian times, he would have come down to us as a greater King Arthur. As it is, under the not dissimilar conditions of British Indian history, from 1820 to 1860, James Outram won for himself, and that in the mouth of his bitterest enemy, the title of The Bayard of India, which the Dean has adopted, and has cut on the marble slab that covers his dust in the centre of the nave of Westminster Abbey.

Outram combined in himself the advantages of English birth and Scottish training. Born at Butterley Hall in Derbyshire, in 1803, he was deprived of his father, a famous civil engineer, two years after. His mother made him what he became. The daughter of the well-known James Anderson, LL.D., a *savant* to whom Lord Melville was much indebted in his administration of Scottish affairs, she continued to be all her life, which was spent chiefly at Aberdeen and Edinburgh, remarkable for her high spirit, ability, and conversation. Her modest *salon* in Edinburgh was frequented by the ablest men of the generation; when dying, the Marquis of Dalhousie said, "If I ever reach Edinburgh again, my first visit shall be to Mrs. Outram." For her eldest son, Francis, the widow had obtained an Indian cadetship, but as to James she consulted an Archdeacon brother-in-law about the Church. When the boy heard of it, he said to his sister, "You see that window; rather than be a parson, I'm out of it; and I'll 'list for a common soldier!" So he too passed through Addiscombe into the Bombay army, where he soon became adjutant of his regiment; and his name began to be known all over Western India as the most reckless and successful tiger-hunter. The youth, who would have made a bad parson, was to display on a wider arena the virtues of the Christian soldier and philanthropist. This he did as civiliser of the shy and savage Bheels; tamer of the still wilder Dangechees; conqueror but friend of the Ameers of Sindh; denouncer, to his own cost, of the evil policy of both the Afghan and Sindh wars; guardian and reformer of the native states of Baroda and Satara; leader in the Persian war; hero of the Alumbagh;

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

twice chief commissioner of Oudh, and protector of its barons from the confiscation threatened by Lord Canning; military member of that Viceroy's cabinet, and counsellor of reforms which have saved and will yet bless more lives in the British army in India than have been sacrificed in all its wars. For sixty years James Outram lived; for forty-three he thus toiled for the good of vast populations and of his own soldier-countrymen here and hereafter.

The story of Outram's civilising the savage Bheels forms the romance of Christian philanthropy. It is not surpassed by anything done by the Lawrences and Abbotts, by Nicholson, Edwardes, and Lake, and the other Christian officers of the Punjab school on the north-west frontier. His object was the same—to convert the most ignorant brigands, who had been the prey of successive Mohammedan rulers, and had fled to the fastnesses of their malarious hills, not only into peaceable subjects, but into loyal soldiers, and their children into decent Christians. The labours of Heracles were nothing to his—nothing to those of the British officers who, during the century from the days of Cleveland, under Warren Hastings, in the Kol and Santal hills, to the present time, when we are converting wild Afghans into faithful sepoys, have carried on the God-given mission of Christianity in the East. We cannot follow Sir F. J. Goldsmid or Sir Bartle Frere into the details. The typical hero of Hellas represents conquests over only material or brute nature; those of Outram and his fellows in our own time have been won over the degradation of man, and through the power of a divine sympathy which Christ was the first to teach. For, like all successful man-tamers and Christianisers, Outram loved the dark races. The splendid fascination of his character, which drew to him his own countrymen till it made the rawest subaltern a miniature of himself, revelled unchecked among tribes and races like those of Western and Northern India. True, alike in the taming of the Bheels, and in the dispersion of the mutineers of 1857, he was first, what Mountstuart Elphinstone used to call him, "his sword," as Colonel Ovens was "his plough" to train to agriculture the wild men when reduced to obedience. But, in the interests of the tribes themselves, no less than of the whole empire, the sword had to do its work first, in order that the plough, and the school, and the Church might have a chance at all. And if Outram was resistless in his courage and strategy as a general, he was even more powerful and successful as the administrator who made war only the handmaid of peace with all its blessings. Even in the darkest hour of the Mutiny, when he was seeking to relieve Lucknow, his pity, his mercy, went forth to the mutinous sepoys; he cared for the poorest camp-follower as particularly as for every white soldier on whom individually, in those days, the fate of the Empire seemed to hang.

It was in the ten years ending with 1838 that Outram gave his life for the Bheels and Dangechees of Khandesh, and the little-known land

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

between Goozerat and Rajpootana, with what results, military and social, the wars and the progress of the next ten years testified. Let the following suffice regarding the social, written to himself by one of his assistants, Colonel C. M. Grant, in 1853 :—"Did I once tell you that, in 1849, we visited Dharangáon? I went to the Bheel lines, saw the regiment on parade, with their band playing 'Love not,' or some civilised air, and then went to the schoolroom, where I saw at least fifty children of these *wild* (!) Bheels busy reading and writing. I do not know when I have been so interested in anything; and if, my dear Outram, the reclaiming of these wild creatures had been the one sole act of your life, it would have been sufficient to ensure you a pleasant retrospect as long as you live—had not your subsequent career been one long act of singleness of purpose and devotedness to your country, through rough disappointments and vexations enough to have tried the firmest resolve. This Bheel episode must, I am sure, form one of the most agreeable and satisfactory retrospects of your active and honourable career."

The highest work of the most renowned soldiers and statesmen of the British Indian Empire may thus prove to be, it is evident, missionary work. But Outram, moreover, resembled almost all these military administrators in this, that he appreciated the missionaries, and drew to those of like spirit with himself. I have not found any evidence that he and Dr. John Wilson met, although the latter passed through the Bheel and the Dang districts more than once, and was full of projects for the Christianisation of the tribes, which the United Presbyterian and Free Churches of Scotland have since partially carried out. It is significant that when driven to seek health in Egypt, he at once sought out the godly Lieder, who long represented Evangelical Christianity at Cairo, and he there began the study of Arabic. But it was in Dr. Duff that he found, most delightedly, a brother soldier, a man of like fiery impetuosity and intense self-devotion to his work, with similar opinions on public events, and a burning affection for the natives. The first time I saw Sir James Outram was when he came to Calcutta to make the personal acquaintance of the Marquis of Dalhousie, who admired him, and when he gave up a Saturday to a careful inspection of the Free Church Institution. I had heard of him as brave even to madness, and was amused when, on the way to the college, he nervously stipulated that he should not be asked to make a speech. And yet he spoke better than many an experienced orator, when carried away by one of his own subjects, especially when called on to eulogise a regiment, or a brother officer, or a private soldier. He and Duff had come somewhat closely into contact, through the *Calcutta Review*, when that was made by the missionary the most influential literary organ in the East. But it was the iniquity of the Sindh War, and the necessity of turning to good account the "Sindh blood-money," as Outram called it, that first brought them together.

The share of Sir Charles Napier in that "useful and humane piece of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

rascality," as he cynically described his own unrighteousness in seizing Sindh, was £6000 in prize-money. The amount allotted to Sir James Outram, who had protested against the whole policy which he was not allowed to prevent, was half that sum. What was he to do with it? When dying, the chief of all the Ameers, whom Outram had drawn to his heart, had entrusted his son to him as a ward, and nobly did the English officer discharge the unusual responsibility. To that ward, after consulting Duff, did he resolve to give the money as some atonement for the wrong. But there were insuperable difficulties in the way of such a course, as Duff reported after a confidential reference to the Government in Calcutta. So it ended in a division of the money among Henry Lawrence's Asylums for the children of British soldiers, the charities in Bombay, and the new mission-school of the Free Church of Scotland at Bansbaria, on the Hooghly. Sir F. J. Goldsmid tells us that this grant, through Dr. Duff, "laid the foundation of an exceptionally warm mutual regard and esteem between these two large-hearted men, drawn together by human sympathies, yet outwardly walking in very different paths of life. An extract from one of his first letters (1846) to this chivalrous soldier of the Gospel—whose sympathy in his righteous cause had been warmly expressed—gives a fair sample of the tone and substance of Outram's extensive private correspondence during these days of trial." Outram wrote: "I do think that in your hands much may be done while advocating the cause of the Ameers, or, rather, disapproving of the course of violence and injustice pursued towards them and their country, to forward the interests of philanthropy, and to deter future rulers from so recklessly trampling on the rights of their equals in the eyes of the Almighty. I rejoice in the forbearing course which our present Governor-General has pursued towards even wanton transgressors against us (though there is some excuse even for them, afforded by our previous acts to others). What a contrast to *our* wanton attack on the Ameers, and greedy appropriation of Sindh! Sir H. Hardinge's measures will be a salutary example to future Governors-General, who will, I hope, turn the resources of this vast empire to better purpose than forming costly armaments to subjugate our neighbours, and expend the resources placed at their disposal in great works calculated to ameliorate the condition of the wretched lower classes of our subjects, and to promote the welfare of the interior of neglected India ere further attempts are made to extend our dominions." We may add to these wise words,—well heeded until Lord Northbrook resigned the seat of the Viceroy rather than depart from them,—that all Sir James Outram wrote of the first Afghan war might now be cited in condemnation of the folly and the iniquity which left the Peshawur border to seek for "a scientific frontier" at such a cost of national character, treasure, and blood.

Never was man more scrupulously obedient to conscience than Outram. For this he suffered half his life through; for this his

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

country and Christendom value him now. This, too, was the source of that fine chivalrous sense of honour which marked him from the time of his attendance at Dr. Bisset's school till the day he was astonished by the applause of Europe for waiving his right as commander, and allowing Havelock the renown of relieving the immortal Lucknow garrison, while he served as a volunteer. When shut up with it for a time, before the final relief, "he was no less particular in his attendance at family prayers than in his daily round of the defences, visits to the hospitals, and other military duties." In many of the able minutes which he wrote when military member of the Governor-General's Council—for he had naturally a facile pen—we meet with personal allusions and spiritual references to which such documents are usually strangers. He was much occupied with the health of the Indian army, after the Mutiny campaigns—health of soul as well as body. Here is a passage of which Major Malan, in "A Soldier's Experience of God's Love," tells us that it was handed to him for guidance, on board ship, by the Brigade-Major of Calcutta, adding, "How I thanked God for putting it into Sir James Outram's heart to write these instructions." "I trust," officially wrote Outram, "I shall not be deemed unreasonable if I express a very decided opinion that daily (before breakfast) the troops should be assembled for the public worship of God. I do not ask for a long service." Then follow details. Very precious is the paragraph of "Auld Jamie"—as his favourite 78th Highlanders always lovingly called the East India Company's commander—on the way in which officers should treat the women and children of their regiment. "It's not every officer, sir," said a private to one who had been kind to them in the Lucknow Residency, "as brings presents to our babies, and lifts his hat to our wives, and calls them Ma'am. She's gone, sir; she's gone, but she minded you to the last, and the time the colonel and you stopped your carriage to give her a lift, poor lass, from the railway on that hot afternoon." And after urging the formation of Ladies' Associations at each station, something like the Institute which he himself created at Dum Dum, Sir James Outram wrote: "Besides being the means of saving the immortal souls of some of our own countrywomen, these associations might tend to the spread of the Gospel in this land, prompting the heathen to moderate the rancour and contempt they bear our holy faith. . . . Whether at present we exert ourselves in behalf of our soldiers' wives as becomes those who realise the truth of the creed they profess, and feel in their hearts what they so glibly utter in their prayers, each man must answer to his own conscience. Mine, I confess, refuses a comforting response." Then he went on to "the subject of the spiritual instruction of our soldiers and their families," expressing a fervent hope that the day is not far distant when each corps will have its own regimental chaplain, whose entire energies shall be exclusively devoted to the spiritual guidance and moral development of its members; when daily shall our soldiers be invited (not compelled) to meet together for

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

the public worship of their God." Do we marvel any longer that the general and the statesman, who did not hesitate to write such words in formal minutes and blue-books, was, of all his contemporaries, the most unselfish, the most modest, the most jealous of the honour of others as of his own, the most lovable, and—next to Henry Lawrence—the best beloved? His pupil, Lord Napier of Magdala, still represents the military side of his character, as his son, Sir Francis, has developed its Christian promise.

The East India Company, with all its faults, was the nurse not only of heroes but of Christians. If the Directors at home too generally fought against the light, the men they sent out often learned to walk in the light, and to hold it forth in the dark places. Outram died at Pau, in 1863, without a struggle. His last words were for others—especially for the Indian Medical service, for which he had long made representations in vain. He bought a repeater, that he might not disturb his servant by asking the time in the weary hours of the night. He ever thought of his attendants—one a gentle Indo-Portuguese, another a poor band-boy, who had been found chained up in prison in Lucknow. In death, as in life, his country covered him with honours. In front of the clubs, Foley's fine equestrian statue reminds Calcutta what he was. On the Thames embankment, London learns his form and face from Noble's statue. But Westminster Abbey is his memorial, beside Clyde, Pollock, Dundonald, Livingstone, John Lawrence. A Bheel and a Balooch are represented as his mourners on the monument erected there by the Secretary of State for India, while the relief below represents the meeting of Clyde, Havelock, and himself at Lucknow. Yes, the great and good men of the East India Company's time are going fast since 1863. Durand and Lawrence, Edwardes and Lake, John Wilson and Alexander Duff, to mention no others, have passed to their reward. A few only are left, like Colin Mackenzie, C.B., Presbyterian and Christian, to remind us still that there were giants in those days, and that we are responsible for their heritage.

GEORGE SMITH.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN WALES.

PART I.

EXCEPTION has sometimes been taken to the claim of the Christian community which, in the Principality, assumes to itself the title of "Presbyterian," and possibly the objection may still be raised. It might thus be urged at the outset, that the heading borne by the present paper is misleading. And certainly, if it is necessary, in order to make good the claim in question, that one be able to prove a direct lineal descent from the Presbyterian Church of the Reformation, the right to the name of Presbyterian must be surrendered by the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

Calvinistic Methodists of Wales. The circumstances under which the latter arose as a separate communion were widely different from those of the Reformation age. The days of Zwingli, Farel, Calvin, Knox, Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, Theodore Beza, Oecolampadius, Bullinger, L. Lavater, and the times of the Protestant martyrs in Britain, had passed away upwards of a century and a-half before. The question of Church government had long ceased to occupy the foreground. The necessity for clearly defining the doctrinal position of the Church was no longer felt. A church organisation, fully equipped and in compact array, could not be expected a second time to spring forth into being, as it had done in the time of the Reformers. The mission of the later age was not so much one of organising as of evangelising. It was to be expected, therefore, that great diversity should exist in the two cases in the application of the same principles. But if the recognition, from the beginning, of the principle of representative Presbyteries and Synods—by whatever name these representative bodies might be called—if the more or less thorough embodiment, in the practice of the Church, of the representative principle, and the gradual approximation to the polity of the Reformed Churches, constitute any right to the name of Presbyterian, then unquestionably the title cannot with justice be denied to the community of Welsh Calvinistic Methodists. Without here attempting a history of this community—a task which many others are in a much better position to undertake—I think it will not be difficult to show that its constitution is radically Presbyterian, and that upon a consistent application of the Presbyterian principle depends, to a great extent, not only its prosperity, but perhaps its very existence, in no distant future.

The great awakening of the eighteenth century, to which Calvinistic Methodism owes its separate existence, began in Wales somewhat earlier than in England, or even the United States. Its commencement dates back to a time prior to the birth-year of Whitefield and Romaine. While England had not yet begun to recover from the blow she had received in the time of Charles the Second, when, by preventing the Presbyterian Church from exercising its ecclesiastical functions, the congregations of that order were left to lapse into Socinianism, or to seek some other kind of ecclesiastical organisation, the Spirit of God was already mightily working in the Principality. There, the difference of language had happily presented a breakwater against the flood of flippant scepticism which was rolling over England. Wales had become, to a terrible extent, unchristian, but was mercifully preserved from becoming anti-christian. One of the immediate precursors of the coming revival was the Rev. Griffith Jones, of Llanddowror, in Carmarthenshire, the beginning of whose ministry falls within the first decade of the eighteenth century. To his deep sympathy with the spiritual needs of his countrymen, Wales owes her earliest Sunday schools, and her day schools for the humbler classes. The work was set going by him

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

in 1729 or 1730, and a report of the progress of these schools was regularly issued from 1736 to 1760. In the latter year, the number of schools established by him stood at 215, and the number of scholars at 8687. The instruction given was not only founded on the Word of God, but must have been largely confined to the Holy Scriptures—the Bible serving as the text-book for all the sciences of that simple encyclopædia. Through the instrumentality of Mr. Jones, two editions of the Bible were circulated amongst the people of the Principality, and the seed was thus sown for the after harvest.

The first directly evangelistic labours in Wales during the eighteenth century were undertaken by Mr. Howell Harris, of Trevecca. This apostolic man had received his education at Oxford, with the intention of taking orders in the Church of England. Quitting the atmosphere of spiritual death which then pervaded the university city, he returned to his native land about 1734, and soon afterwards entered upon the work of teaching and preaching the saving truths of the Gospel in his own neighbourhood. He was then not more than twenty-one years of age. About the same time, Whitefield, his junior by some months, was joining the society of a few young men in Oxford—comprising Mr. Morgan, Mr. Wesley, and about a dozen others—who had already received the sobriquet of Methodists.* It was five years after this, when the renown of both men was already widely spread, that they were privileged to meet. Whitefield says, under date of March, 1739, speaking of his own visit to Cardiff: "I was much refreshed with a sight of my dear brother, Howell Harris, whom I knew not in person, but long loved in the bowels of Jesus Christ, and on whose behalf I have often felt my soul drawn out in prayer." Concerning Harris's work, Whitefield says: "He is despised by all who are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, but God has greatly blessed his endeavours. Many call and even venerate him as their spiritual father, and would, I believe, lay down their lives for his sake. He discourses generally in a field, but at other times in some house, from a wall, or a table, or anything else. He has established nearly thirty societies in South Wales, and still the field of his labours is becoming wider. He is full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." Howell Harris more than once applied for ordination in the Established Church, but never succeeded in obtaining it.

A new impulse was soon given to the work of evangelisation by the devoted labours of Daniel Rowlands, of Llangeitho, in Cardiganshire, who was admitted to orders in 1733, at the age of twenty. Being converted to God some five years later, he was gradually led into the full light and liberty of Christian truth. The senior of Harris by one

* This name, originally borne by a severe school of physicians practising about the time of the Christian era (*Methodici Medici*, Celsus in *Praef.*), was first bestowed upon them by an Oxford student. It was subsequently borne by all evangelical preachers within the English Establishment.

(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.)

year, he was his junior in the apostolic work, and regarded the despised evangelist with the greatest reverence and affection. In October, 1742, he writes to Harris, rejoicing greatly in the progress of the work of God in South Wales and North, but bemoaning that "the blessed liberty which remains for the children of God is still hidden from me." To this liberty he would appear to have attained soon after, as his communion services of 1743 and following years were scenes of spiritual refreshment to growing numbers. Besides Mr. Rowlands, several other young clergymen, as the Rev. William Williams,* Rev. Peter Williams, Rev. Howell Davies, &c., entered with equal ardour upon the work of evangelising. In October, 1742, Howell Harris writes to Whitefield: "I have heard most glorious news from Wales"—he was himself labouring in England at the time—"of the success attending brother Rowlands, and many others. They are wounded by scores, and flock under the word by thousands. There are now in Wales ten clergymen who are wonderfully owned by the Lord Jesus Christ." Most of these clergymen were either subsequently ejected, or voluntarily left the Establishment.

At this period, numbers repaired from all parts of Wales, journeying over mountain roads and fording swollen streams, sometimes at the peril of their lives, to receive the symbols of their Lord's death at the hands of these honoured ministers. In 1743, it was nothing uncommon for a company of from fifteen hundred to twenty-five hundred to partake together of the Communion in the churches under the ministration of Mr. Rowlands. In 1746, we read of as many as three thousand commemorating the Lord's death under the ministry of Daniel Rowlands, and two thousand under that of Howell Davies. The labours of Mr. Rowlands ranged in one year over the counties of Montgomery, Brecon, Caermarthen, and Glamorgan, whole congregations often crying out under the power of the Word, "so as often to drown the voice of the preacher." In Carnarvonshire, also, the people are described as flocking in thousands to hear the Word of Life. And so the work went on for long years, hardly hindered by the coolness which afterwards sprang up between Daniel Rowlands and Howell Harris on some slight shade of doctrinal difference. The latter, notwithstanding his peculiarity of view, was regarded by many with undiminished affection until his death. This event took place in 1773, some three years after that of his friend Whitefield, and four years before that of Augustus Toplady, who had on one occasion taken a leading part in the great preaching services at Trevecca. Daniel Rowlands entered his rest in October, 1790, after half a century of labour in the kingdom of God. During this time, he had lived to see the work begun by Howell Harris and himself established and consolidated. Who can

* The earliest poet of Welsh Methodism; he died 11th January, 1791, at the age of seventy-four, after an evangelistic ministry of about forty-eight years. Several of his English hymns are very widely known.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

doubt but the reconciliation between these two faithful servants of God, after their brief estrangement, then became complete ?

The congregations gathered together, as the fruit of these missionary labours, were wont to hold their weekly societies, or private meetings of the members for edification, under the leadership of the minister or elders present. The monthly meeting of the Presbytery, which had the oversight of the various congregations within its bounds, is first mentioned in a letter of Howell Harris, dated April, 1743, in which he says: "The private exhorters are to come themselves to our monthly meetings, that which is nearest them, where the ministers and superintendents are to be, as many as can. I believe the plan in general is of God, and consequently will stand." And it *has* stood until the present day. The earlier diets of these meetings were set apart for devotion and mutual confirmation in the faith, and the subsequent ones to the determination of business matters. The concluding services appear to have been then, as now, devoted to the work of evangelistic preaching.

The first meeting of the Quarterly Association was held in Carmarthenshire not much later, and these meetings became from that time an established institution. Mr. Williams of Kidderminster, who was present at the one held in Trevecca in June, 1746, thus gives his own impression of the movement: "We assembled for religious worship in a barn near Mr. Howell Harris's. There were present three clergymen and about twenty exhorters,* one of whom, Mr. Richards, preached and prayed in Welsh." "I learned that the Lord has wonderfully owned their endeavours, and spread their influence over the greatest part of Wales, and all in the space of eleven years from the first beginning of it; so that, within the Principality of Wales, about six or seven clergymen [Mr. Williams' memory is here at fault], forty exhorters, and a hundred and fifty religious societies were now preaching and receiving the pure Gospel of Christ." During the past ninety years, at least, a meeting of the Quarterly Association has been held regularly in North Wales and another in South Wales. According to the declaration of 1823, "In every Quarterly Association, the whole Connexion is supposed to be present by representation; and the Association has the authority to decide all questions pertaining to the Connexion everywhere. It is the duty of the Association to take oversight of the cause of Christ among the Calvinistic Methodists of England and Wales; and revise, and if necessary alter, all resolutions of private societies and monthly meetings." The open-air services held at the close of these Association meetings have often been the scene of remarkable awakenings. An audience of from fifteen to twenty-five thousand would then be aroused to concern and anxiety by the terrible warnings, or subdued to penitence under the melting pathos, of some mighty evangelist. Nowhere, perhaps, has the

* The name then given to all preachers who had not received ordination to the work of the ministry.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

word of reconciliation been listened to with more eager interest than at some of the great gatherings of Bala or Trevecca.

A new phase was entered upon by the Calvinistic Methodism of North Wales especially, during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, owing in no small measure to the influence of the Rev. T. Charles, who joined the Communion in 1785. Mr. Charles had received ordination at Oxford in 1778; but the earnestness of his ministrations proved an insuperable barrier in the way of his obtaining a fixed place of labour within the Establishment. Casting in his lot with the Methodists at the time when the need of a successor to Mr. Rowlands must shortly be felt, he continued for the remaining twenty-nine years of his life to labour in the cause of Christ among them with ardour and manifold blessing. His exertions to obtain copies of the Bible for the people of his native land (1804), which resulted in the formation of the Bible Society, are well known; but his lifelong labours for the spiritual elevation of his countrymen and the Christian training of the young, which have endeared him to the hearts of all Welshmen, are not so generally known. Like Howell Harris, Thomas Charles was called home at the early age of fifty-nine. His death, in the year 1814, sent a thrill of grief throughout the whole Principality, where the name of Charles of Bala had long become a household word. The verdict of Daniel Rowlands in 1785, that Mr. Charles was "the Lord's gift to North Wales," has been amply corroborated in the experience of successive generations.

During the lifetime of Mr. Charles, there were drawn up the first written regulations of the body, prescribing the order of proceedings to be observed at the Quarterly Associations. These regulations were definitively adopted at the Bala Association, in 1790, as an authoritative document with regard to Church order. At the beginning of the present century (1801), the "Rules of Discipline, or General Principles of Church Government," were published, with the view of setting forth the judgment of the body on questions of general polity. This was followed, in the course of a few years, by another step of the greatest practical importance. During the first three-quarters of a century of its existence, none had been ordained to the work of the ministry within the communion itself. The members were dependent for the ordinances of Christianity upon those ministers who had received Episcopal ordination; and the number of faithful labourers amongst these was felt to be too small to minister adequately to the people's needs. After long and earnest deliberation, therefore, it was resolved to ordain certain duly qualified brethren, of good repute as preachers and teachers, to the work of the ministry and administration of the ordinances of the Gospel. Accordingly, in the year 1811, eight preachers were ordained by the brethren in North Wales in the month of June; and in like manner, in the following August, thirteen brethren in South Wales. The questions to be answered by the candidates before receiving ordination were prepared by Mr. Charles.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

To the Calvinistic-Methodist Church, as thus constituted, a Confession of Faith in harmony with the teaching of Scripture and the Reformation now became a matter of the first necessity. In the early days of Methodism, this want had not been experienced to the same extent. The Calvinistic articles of the Church of England sufficed to express the belief and experience of the earlier preachers. The doctrines of grace lay at the basis of their whole proclamation. Men like Romaine, Toplady, Whitefield, Daniel Rowlands, and John Elias, could not rest content with announcing the free gift of salvation, but were impelled, in the spirit of Matt. xi. 25-30 and Rom. xi. 33-36, to trace back the whole effect of this gift, in the experience of the believer, to the eternal purpose of God in Christ. Such preaching, indeed, called forth great opposition and considerable misrepresentation, but was marvellously owned of God to the salvation of souls. Doctrinal differences between Evangelical preachers in Wales during the second half of the eighteenth century were almost unknown. "The Connexion," writes Mr. Elias of his own communion, "was not called Calvinistic-Methodist at the first, as there was not a body of Arminian Methodists in the country. But when the Wesleyans came amongst us, it was necessary to add the word *Calvinistic*, to show the difference. There were, before this, union and concord in the great things of the Gospel among the different denominations of Christians in Wales. The Independents agreed fully with the Methodists in the doctrines of grace. They used to acknowledge the Westminster Catechism as containing the substance of their doctrines. The Baptists also in general were of the same views as to the doctrine. There were union, love, and concord among the brethren, 'speaking the same thing.'" The necessity, however, for the expression of a common belief, with regard to the great truths of the Gospel, was clearly recognised during the first quarter of the present century—not because the doctrine of salvation was confounded with salvation itself, but because the truth is the *element* in which the life moves and works. In the meantime, a Catechism of Christian Doctrine had been composed and published by Mr. Charles (first edition, 1789; second edition, 1791)*, and a translation of Nowell's Latin Catechism had been made into Welsh by Mr. Jones, of Denbigh. The Confession of Faith, drawn up at the instance, and in great measure through the agency, of Mr. Elias, was fully accepted by the ministers and elders at two Associations, and was unanimously adopted in 1823 as one of the doctrinal standards of the body.

* Copies of the first two editions still exist in the library of Dr. Edwards. This Catechism passed through numerous editions, both in Welsh and English.

CHURCH JURISDICTION AND AMERICAN LAW.

A RECENT paper in this magazine discusses civil and spiritual jurisdiction in the United States, and in doing so, refers to certain theories on Church jurisdiction which I had occasion to throw out a good many years ago. It refers to them in appreciative and indeed flattering terms. But it maintains that those ideas, whether right or wrong in themselves, and whether applicable or not to the jurisprudences of Europe, are at all events excluded by "the fundamental provisions of American law."^{*} This is a matter on which I have no right to express a peremptory opinion. I am too much indebted to the vigorous and philosophic intellect of American jurists to intrude rashly upon their discussion of the higher legal problems, and too much indebted to Mr. Bullitt individually to controvert, without much hesitation, views which he has always maintained with force of logic and strength of conviction. But there are two reasons which may excuse even a stranger who enters upon another jurisprudence to the limited extent which I at present contemplate.

The first is, that Mr. Bullitt's view is confessedly opposed to that of the highest authority upon the subject with which he deals. We all know that the State Courts in America are independent of the Supreme Court of the United States. But the latter is the highest authority upon "the fundamental provisions of American law," and it is in reference to these fundamental provisions that Mr. Bullitt feels himself compelled to attack the case of *Watson v. Jones*, decided in 1871 by the Supreme Court of the United States. Had that been a mere question of real estate, the Supreme Court would no doubt have followed the local law of Kentucky. But being a question of public law in connection with certain real estate in Kentucky, it necessarily introduced, as Mr. Bullitt points out, the fundamental principles of American law; and whether it states them rightly, or, as he thinks, wrongly, it at all events states them deliberately and after much examination.

"The novelty of the questions presented to this Court for the first time, their intrinsic importance and far-reaching influence, and the knowledge that the schism in which the case originated has divided the Presbyterian Church throughout Kentucky and Missouri, have seemed to us to justify the careful and laborious examination and discussion which we have made of the principles which should govern the case. For the same reasons we have held it under advisement for a year."

Mr. Bullitt thinks the opinion which was the result of this twelve-

^{*} "Civil and Spiritual Jurisdiction in the United States." By Hon. T. W. Bullitt, Louisville, Kentucky. *The Catholic Presbyterian*, February, 1880.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

month's incubation to be "clearly against the established weight of precedent," and to be excluded by American law, while it may be open to that of England. But the U.S. Supreme Court itself, after a "laborious examination" of American precedents spread over several pages, holds its conclusions to be "supported by a preponderating weight of judicial authority" in America, and, what is of at least as much importance, to be "founded in a broad and sound view of the relations of Church and State under our system of laws." Still more remarkably, it concedes at once that the doctrine of the English Courts, founded on the English institutions, is contrary to its own. Consequently, what Mr. Bullitt thinks "may be open to English law," is, in the view of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the meantime closed to English law; while those anticipations of mine for the law of the United States, which my critic holds to be excluded by "the fundamental provisions of American law," are, in the judgment of the Supreme Court, not only already sustained by a preponderance of American precedents, but necessarily called for by the fundamental relations of Church and State in the American Union.

The question, therefore, is at least not closed against me, and my second reason for saying a few words upon it in *The Catholic Presbyterian*, is that these shall be words of conciliation. I certainly sympathise more with the view stated by the Supreme Court in 1871 than with that of Mr. Bullitt in 1880. But the latter view is one for which a great deal may be said, and which two, at least, of the State Courts of America seem to me to have recently sanctioned. It would not become a stranger to emphasise or to exaggerate any difference of opinions in a jurisprudence which he does not profess to know. But it may be allowed to him to suggest whether the difference and contrast between the views of an individual lawyer and that of the Supreme Court of a country is so great as has been alleged by the former; whether, after all, the question is not partly a question of words; and whether, in so far as it is more than that, American law is not as competent as any other "to deal face to face with Churches, as institutions founded neither on statute nor on contract, but on conscience towards God."

I. Is it true that, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1871, "the doctrine is announced, in effect, that the judgment of the highest Church tribunal is *conclusive* upon the Civil Court as to the jurisdiction of the body rendering the judgment?" This is literally the whole description given by Mr. Bullitt of the position which was then so "squarely," or, as Scottish lawyers still say, so solemnly, taken up. But the following passage from the only opinion delivered on the occasion seems conclusive against the representation:—

"It may very well be conceded that if the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church should undertake to try one of its members for murder, and punish him with death or imprisonment, its sentence would be of no validity in a civil court

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

or anywhere else. Or if, at the instance of one of its members, it should entertain jurisdiction between him and another member as to their individual right to property, real or personal, the right in no sense depending on ecclesiastical questions, its decision would be utterly disregarded by any civil court where it might be set up. And it might, in a certain general sense, be very justly said, that it was because the General Assembly had no jurisdiction of the case."

This is clearly inconsistent with the description of the doctrine of the Court which has been suggested by Mr. Bullitt. Indeed, the doctrine actually laid down, with the qualification just quoted, seems to me to be nearly equivalent to Mr. Bullitt's own well-weighed statement of what the law ought to be:—

"As to matters within the defined or *ordinarily recognised* jurisdiction of the Church tribunals, the Civil Courts *will not review* the judgments or disregard the action of the Spiritual Courts, whatever their view as to the justice or injustice thereof.

"If an act or judgment of the spiritual tribunal be *clearly beyond* the scope of its power or jurisdiction, as conferred by the constitution of the Church, it will be disregarded by the Civil Courts, in so far as it may affect property rights, and to that extent only."

Whether the Supreme Court, in the case of *Watson v. Jones*, successfully applied "in effect" the principles which on the same occasion it announced, I should be very sorry to say. But that, on that occasion, it held the Church sentence which it refused to review, to be within the "ordinarily recognised" Church jurisdiction, or at least not "clearly beyond" it, seems to me, having read the judgment, indubitable. And the Court expressly announced that if the sentence were clearly beyond the Church jurisdiction, it would not hold the Assembly's judgment conclusive *quoad civilia*.

II. It being admitted, then, on the one hand, that American law does not hold the judgment of the Church always conclusive as to its own jurisdiction; and, on the other, that there is an ordinarily recognised jurisdiction whose exercise it does hold conclusive, the next question that interests me is, what is meant, in America, by this "*ordinary* recognition" of Church jurisdiction. That there is such an ordinary recognition is broadly and strongly maintained by the Supreme Court, and on this point there is a real contrast between its judgment and the tone of Mr. Bullitt's remarks. Yet even he, indirectly and perhaps grudgingly, admits it. Now, what is the extent of this recognition? And what is its origin? On this matter, Mr. Bullitt lays down two propositions, the first of which seems accurate, while the second seems neither accurate in itself nor universally to follow from the first:—

"1. The effect to be given by the Civil Courts to the acts and judgments of Church tribunals is precisely that which is given to them by the constitution of the Church itself.

"2. To determine this, the Civil Court will examine and construe for itself the terms of the Church constitution."

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

My reading of American law would suggest that it universally concedes to Church acts (at least in Protestant Churches), precisely the effect given them by the constitution of the Church itself; but that it does *not* ordinarily—does not, except in unusual and extraordinary cases—examine and construe that constitution. It is, of course, open to it, for its own purposes, to make such an examination. This is conceded on all hands. But my impression is that it does not in fact ordinarily do so. It does not find it necessary to do it. And the reason is at once to be found in the first and less ambiguous of the two propositions. American law, it is said, concedes to Church tribunals precisely what the constitution of the Church concedes to them. But what does that constitution concede to them? It is this at least—*Jurisdiction*. Other things may be doubtful; details even here may be questioned; but that all Presbyterian Churches claim jurisdiction by their fundamental constitution, and that from the highest source, I suppose there is no doubt. And if American law gives to their acts and judgments the effect given them by their own constitution, then it gives them the effect of acts of jurisdiction—of “judgments” in the strictest sense. This is a mere translation into particulars of Mr. Bullitt’s first proposition above quoted. But if it is a true translation, it shows why the second proposition may be doubtful. I speak with great deference on the question of facts; but it has not seemed to me that American law, in order to determine the effect of Church acts, ordinarily examines the Church constitution. And the reason probably is, that it assumes them and accepts them as acts of jurisdiction, and, where no excess of jurisdiction is alleged, examines no farther, but takes them as conclusive. This I take to be the doctrine of the Supreme Court in the case of 1871, as well as of many others. No doubt, in that case, excess of jurisdiction was alleged, and ably pressed upon the Court by Mr. Bullitt and others. Nor did the Court, as we have already seen in the extract from its judgment, deny that there might be *such* an excess of jurisdiction as would justify its examining and reversing *quoad civilia*, though they held that no such case had there been alleged or proved. Whether the Court was right in this application of its principles—whether Mr. Bullitt and his friends of the Kentucky Church had not alleged such a case of unconstitutional acting as to take it out of the ordinary and admitted jurisdiction, and so give remedies *quoad civilia**—is a much narrower

* Mr. Bullitt understands all this region too well to make any suggestion of the Civil Courts reversing the spiritual acts of the Church Courts to ecclesiastical effects, even when alleged to be unconstitutional, or ordering them to do such acts as it considers more constitutional. On this point he seems at one with the views given in the admirable lectures of Judge Strong, published in New York a few years ago. May I ask Mr. Bullitt to consider whether this remarkable exception—well established in American law, and nearly equally so in that of Scotland and England—does not suggest a difference in the way in which these associations are regarded even by public law? His theory of mere contract would suggest a *mandamus*; and a recent article in the *Presbyterian Review* (July, 1880), suggests the pernicious confusion which may be caused in less instructed minds by a bias against the acknowledgment of ordinary Church jurisdiction.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

question, and one on which I desire to offer no opinion. That is a question which will occasionally emerge where the Courts acknowledge a jurisdiction as given to Churches "by the constitution of the Church itself," as well as where they ignore it. It is, therefore, unfortunate that Mr. Bullitt's argument leads him to deal with the whole claim of Churches to jurisdiction in a hostile, or at least in an ambiguous way. For what he says is—

"One principle has received universal recognition [in America]. Church tribunals possess no *jurisdiction*, in the sense that Civil Courts use that term—viz., as an authority derived from the sovereign power of the State."

I venture to call this ambiguous, because the writer is not able to say simply that it is in America a universally recognised principle that Church tribunals possess no jurisdiction. That would have been an assertion important for his argument. But he avoids it, and goes on to say that they have no jurisdiction "in the sense" specified—a sense in which they never claimed it, and in which no one imagines that they have it, and on which no question has arisen. The only question which has arisen is, whether American law concedes to American Churches jurisdiction in the sense in which they claim it.* No Church in America claims to have an authority derived from the sovereign power of the State. But all Churches—certainly all Presbyterian Churches—in America claim jurisdiction in the strictest sense and in the fullest measure—a jurisdiction from a still higher source than the sovereign power of the State. They all claim this by their constitution; and if the Courts concede to them what their constitution claims, then they concede this. And my impression as a stranger is, that they ordinarily, and as a matter of course, concede this to them, and do not inquire into any specialties of constitution or jurisdiction, unless some allegation is made as to peculiarity of constitution or of jurisdiction.

III. This at least is the public law of the United States of America, as laid down by its Supreme Court. The difficulty in accepting it appears to arise partly from the old puzzle between "contract" and "authority." "Church tribunals," Mr. Bullitt says, "possess no jurisdiction. The powers they have are such only as they derive from the compact or law of association, as Courts of the parties' own choosing." Is there really any such contrast as is here suggested? Why should they not have *both* characteristics—an origin in association, and a result in jurisdiction? The jurisdiction, Presbyterians hold, comes from heaven, but the submission to it is by consent of men; and both sides are found in the crucial utterance of the Apostle, "What have I to do to *judge* them that are without?" The same is the case in civil government. It is a Divine ordinance; but the act by which one kind

* Of course, to speak of the other as the only "sense in which Civil Courts use the term," is to beg the question, or is again ambiguous.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

of civil government rather than another is constituted is by consent of the people ; and the act by which I submit myself to a particular civil government—*e.g.*, by emigrating to America—is a voluntary act. The two things are not inconsistent. Everywhere in law the same paradox meets us. Take marriage. It is a Divine institution, say some lawyers ; it is a voluntary contract, say others. The truth is, it is both. So Church jurisdiction is a Divine ordinance ; but, even in the hands of an apostle, it does not touch “them that are without.” And Presbyterians, of all men, are those who should be least puzzled by these paradoxes, for they have always held, and held strongly, the two principles. Two hundred years ago, Gisbert Voetius, a great authority among our forefathers when Scotland and Holland stood side by side, stated the thing in very neat formula. All government, or at least all Church government, has, the old lawyers and divines held, three

Fundamenta.

1. *Remotum et commune (fundamentum)=Institutio Divina.*
2. *Propinquum= Applicatio hujus divine institutionis ad hanc individua.*
3. *Proprium et proximum=Consensus mutuus.*

That is to say, Church jurisdiction is founded neither on Divine institution alone nor on contract alone, but on both, the one being united to the other by the individual “applying” the general Divine institution to his own circumstances. When I published my studies on this subject fifteen years ago, I had not read the famous old treatise of Gisbert Voetius. But it seems to me that his “middle term” is not at all essentially different from that which I then ventured to suggest : “Church authority historically rests, and permanently rests, if not upon Divine right, which the Courts will not allow, at least upon a persuasion of Divine right—*i.e.*, upon conscientious obligation—a different category from contract.” A different category, but one not inconsistent with it, any more than it is with the Divine institution—rather, intermediate between both.

IV. “There can be little doubt,” I went on to say,* “that our Courts will yet have to deal face to face with Churches as institutions founded neither on statute nor on contract, but on conscience towards God ; and there can be equally little doubt, in spite of some appearances, that our law will not then be found to have prematurely disabled itself from the discharge of its highest functions.” With the sentiments of this utterance, of which he speaks much too favourably, Mr. Bullitt “takes no issue.” But he says : “Coming apparently within the range of the political or public relations of the Church to the State, I apprehend that what may be open in this direction to English law, is closed

* “Law of Creeds in Scotland,” p. 274.

by the fundamental provisions of the American law." Yet the chief authority on American law has, as we have seen, maintained the existence of an independent Church jurisdiction in much more explicit terms than English and Scotch law have done—though both of these, I am glad to say, are rather fulfilling my augury of 1867. It has maintained it in terms so strong as to appear to Mr. Bullitt to threaten the exclusion of legitimate interference by the Civil Courts, even as to mere property questions, and where excess of jurisdiction is alleged. That, we are all agreed, would be unfortunate. But laying that on one side, the recognition, by the law of the United States, of the Church jurisdiction which all Presbyterian Churches claim—the statement, by the highest authority, that such a recognition is consistent with or demanded by the fundamental provisions of American law—cannot but be welcome to the Churches whose claim is so recognised. And I, for one, am not surprised that the law of America should, on this matter, have outstripped that of Europe. The latter has always conceded a certain "jurisdiction" to the one Church which it established; but it has tended to be, in Mr. Bullitt's words, "a jurisdiction in the sense that Civil Courts use that term—viz., an authority derived from the sovereign power of the State." The fundamental provision of American law, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," effectually prevents that result on the other side of the Atlantic. But is there anything in the foundations of the American constitution to prohibit the recognition of Churches, as founded not merely "on contract, but on conscience toward God?" I find a great deal very favourable to such recognition. To the end of time, Congress is to make no law prohibiting "the free exercise of religion," and this central regulation is borne out by the constitution of the separate States. "The natural and inalienable right" of all men "to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience," is claimed as fundamental by Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Ohio, Florida, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Texas; as "natural and infeasible," by Pennsylvania, Illinois, Tennessee, and Missouri; as "the duty" of every man, by Maryland; as an "inestimable privilege" by New Jersey, Georgia, and Alabama; as his "right and duty" by Massachusetts; as his "natural right" by Indiana and Oregon; and as "through Divine goodness his right by nature," by Delaware. And on this foundation, all of these State constitutions go on to provide (to quote only that of Connecticut), "that this exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall for ever be free to all persons." These are some of the fundamental provisions of American public law. And after looking at them once more, I cannot express surprise that its supreme tribunal should have affirmed the existence of Church jurisdiction (not in the sense in which Presbyterians reject that jurisdiction, but in the sense in which they claim it)—should have affirmed it more broadly than has been done as yet by any other jurisprudence of the day.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

And now for a few words of conciliation. Mr. Bullitt is right in holding that the American constitution and American public law do not expressly sanction the jurisdiction of any particular Church. On the other hand, I seem to have observed that as each Church comes before American law with its property question, that law at once recognises its full jurisdiction over its members, and this without inquiry (except in special cases), and as if it were a public fact. Are the two things very irreconcilable? I think not. Their coincidence merely suggests that for some reason (presumably to be found in the American constitution, and which even a stranger's eye readily discerns there), American law is peculiarly ready to *assume* the existence of Church jurisdiction, in its fullest sense and with all its incidents—and that, ordinarily, it assumes this anterior to all proof. Mr. Bullitt no doubt holds that his law assumes this so readily, because it knows it could at once be proved; and that so, after all, the thing is founded in contract. Well, be it so; but how comes it that American law, which singles out no Church to establish it, is peculiarly ready to recognise a jurisdiction in all Churches in things spiritual? The reason is surely not far to seek. Had the law expressly and exceptionally sanctioned a jurisdiction in the case of any one Church, that would have been readily confounded with granting the jurisdiction. It might have implied—it would have implied, even in the mind of so able a lawyer as Mr. Bullitt—that its jurisdiction was from the supreme power of the State; that is, it would have implied what Presbyterian Churches hold to be an insult, and what on all hands is admitted to be contrary to the constitution of America. But by not doing this, it is open to American law to admit—and apparently to admit at once and without inquiry—that there is a Church jurisdiction; a jurisdiction which some lawyers say is derived from contract, but which, at all events, is not derived from the civil power, or from the contract which founds the civil power, but from some source altogether outside it. For these reasons, among my friends of the Southern Church in Kentucky, I prefer the way in which Dr. Stuart Robinson puts his case to that chosen upon this last occasion by Mr. Bullitt. The former believes in Church jurisdiction, and lays stress on anti-Erastianism; the latter seems at least to attack Church jurisdiction, and to give a power to the American Courts essentially the same with European Erastianism. I do not think he intends it, and for the limited purpose of his argument—viz., to give remedies *quoad civilia* when Church Courts have transgressed their jurisdiction,—the course he seems to take is not in the least necessary. Far better to acknowledge the ecclesiastical jurisdiction generally, with such subordination as the particular constitution gives, and then appeal to the Civil Courts for remedies in their own region against excess of jurisdiction, exactly as you do against similar excess in any other foreign jurisdiction. That is what we are coming to even in England and Scotland, where the law, notwithstanding the protest of Presbyterianism, has always had a tendency to regard the Church juris-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

diction which it acknowledged as *derived* from the State. In America there is no such danger. The constitution of the Union, and the fundamental provisions of its law, contain two things broadly legible across the Atlantic. One is, a confession that the sovereign power of the State is itself limited, and far from coextensive with the greater interests of human life. The other is, that religion and worship, which are thus excluded from the power and sphere of the State, are matters of conscience. It seems to me to follow that American law is at least as competent as that of Europe "to deal face to face with Churches as institutions founded neither on statute nor" merely "on contract, but on conscience towards God."

A. TAYLOR INNES.

EARLY BRITISH CHURCH: THE PASSING OF ARTHUR.

TENNYSON has two poems on Arthur's end—one, the "*Morte d'Arthur*," published in 1842; the other, the "*Passing of Arthur*," with the addition of 125 lines at the beginning, and 24 at the end, published about a generation after, and closing the completed "*Idylls of the King*." Whether the poet had changed his view, meantime, of the original legend, I have no means of knowing; but there can be no doubt that the later title is most strictly suggestive of the truth, Malory had evidently two legends before him in making his book—one, the "*Passing of Arthur*" in the barge, when he bids farewell to Sir Bedivere, saying: "I will away into the vale of Avilion, to heal me of my grievous wound;" the other, of the knight finding afterwards a new-made grave near a hermitage at Glastonbury, and learning that at midnight "a number of ladies had brought a dead corpse and prayed the hermit to bury him." "Alas!" said Sir Bedivere, "that was my lord, King Arthur." Tennyson has entirely dropped this legend of the burial. It is manifestly of later origin, invented to magnify the traditions of the tomb at Glastonbury, which are evidently of English, and not of Celtic origin. It is inconsistent with the other legend, as Malory gives it: "Yet some men still say, in many parts of England, that King Arthur is not dead, but had, by the will of our Lord Jesu, reached another place. And men say that he shall come again and win the holy cross. I will not say it shall be so, but rather I will say, here in this world he changed his life. But many say there is written on his tomb this verse—

'Hic jacet Arthurus Rex quondam, Rexque futurus.'

We can understand how the legend, that Arthur was not dead but would come again, should survive, if, after his deadly wound, he was

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

withdrawn to a barge, and his attendant knight, left behind to see after the scattered army, saw the seamen "row from land," and that the barge at length—

"With oar and sail
Moved from the brink, like some full-breasted swan—
That, fluting a wild carol ere her death,
Ruffles her pure cold plume, and takes the flood
With swarthy webs."

The legends that can be trusted point to the north, rather than the south, as the scene of Arthur's last battles, the battles of the south having taken place at an earlier part of his career, before he reached his highest power. It is perfectly probable that, considering his circumstances when he received his fatal wound, the hero was led or carried to some friendly boat in waiting at the shore, and that sail was then set for Armorica, the refuge of so many brave Britons after the final struggle had ended in despair. There is a legend that places Guinevere's grave in the north, but none which fixes Arthur's there. Besides, the legends of Brittany are unanimous in representing that he was buried in that region.* This was a land of kinsfolk; there was frequent communication for generations before, not only with South Britain, but with North, as in later times between Scotland and France. Arthur, in Malory's version, speaks only of "the vale of Avilion," in prose that reveals the plain fact underlying the legend; whereas the poet translates:—

"I am going a long way
With these thou seest—if indeed I go—
(For all my mind is clouded with a doubt)
To the island-valley of Avilion;
Where falls not hail, or rain, or any snow,
Nor ever wind blows loudly; but it lies
Deep-meadow'd, happy, fair with orchard-lawns
And bowery hollows crowned with summer sea,
Where I will heal me of my grievous wound."

The friends and followers of Arthur, left in Britain, might with good reason be in doubt as to his fate. He had passed away; they knew not if he had died: he might return again and renew his work. Thus the legend would grow out of a fact, and would continue after news came of his death. For the first story would remain with some the only story; and when the later story of his death was told, it would get mixed with the persistent hopes embodied in the first, as we see it in Malory's version. The legend, thus stripped to its inmost truth, brings before us the last fight of Arthur, the tide of battle rolling from near Linlithgow, nearer and nearer towards the shore of the Firth of Forth; the hours of

* "Breton-Folk: An Artistic Tour in Brittany."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

suffering and the ebbing life ; and the wounded king, partly led and partly borne on broad shoulders over the frozen hills, when—

“On a sudden, lo ! the level lake
And the long glories of the wintry morn.
Then saw they how there hove a dusky barge,
Dark as a funeral scarf from stem to stern.”

Then, as it moves away with the dying hero, Sir Bedivere

“Clomb
Even to the highest he could climb, and saw—
Straining his eyes beneath an arch of hand,
Or thought he saw—the speck that bare the king,
Down that long water opening on the deep.”

Brittany is, in some respects, the fatherland of the Briton. From that west wing of Gaul probably south-west Britain was peopled ; and there was naturally a very close relation between the two landing-places on each side of the Channel, in Brittany and Cornwall. Brittany still retains its old Celtic peculiarities. The ancient language is still spoken, and it is difficult even to the French. Dress and manners are still of the ancient time ; their love of song, their dislike of strangers, their welcome for wandering beggars, their distaste even for water in some forms, notwithstanding their snowy caps and collars, remind us of their kinsmen in some parts of Wales and Ireland and the Scottish Highlands. The Breton, like the Highlander, is proud, dignified, serious, respectful to superiors, yet without cringing. Mrs. M'Quoid says : “There is perhaps more resemblance between Britons and Bretons than between Bretons and Frenchmen ; one special point of resemblance is that of being good sailors. The French navy is chiefly composed of Bretons.”* The most Celtic scenery is to be found in Finisterre ; and here, just beyond the Land's End of France, is the Isle de Sein, once connected with the mainland, the Avalon or Avilion to which, Breton legends say, Merlin brought Arthur to be healed of his wound. Some of these legends point to Morbihan, a district farther south, as the birthplace of Arthur, very likely because it may have been the birthplace of his ancestors. Here there are traces of Gildas, whose lamentations over the desolation of Britain are preserved. Brittany has had the singular fortune to have maintained its original life and language through invasions of Romans, Franks, Normans, and English. It is still as conservative as ever. It need not surprise us, therefore, that in the sixth century Arthur should seek in disaster and death to escape among his old and well-tried kinsmen. The bark in which he sailed may have come to the Forth with material help for his closing struggle, and have been kept near the shore till the fate of that battle was seen.

We have thus reason to believe that Arthur, when his work was done in Britain, passed to Brittany ; he may have died there, or on the way ;

* “Through Brittany.”

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

but that matters little, for the subsequent history of the Arthurian legends in modern literature* proves that the spirit of his heroic Christian life was cherished there, and saturated the song and story of France. This is all the more likely, because many of the friends and followers of Arthur fled to the same hospitable shore. Something new, though of kindred character, was thus introduced among the other admirable qualities of the old Breton stock. It had long been noted for endurance and bravery, for a love of liberty, and for a singular retentiveness that has preserved, till the present day, its peculiar type of human character, notwithstanding the many influences which have modified all the rest of modern France. On the recognised principles of heredity, we are justified in tracing back the elements that have contributed to national as well as individual character. Such elements sometimes remain long latent, and yet appear at some subsequent period with original force; and in the fact that Brittany alone of the many distinct districts in France, through centuries, and amid many social convulsions, retained its independent and original character, we may be sure that its influence in many ways must have been immense on minds throughout the country which, amidst alien elements and frequent tyranny, had affinities for what was free and heroic in life,—physical, mental, moral, and social. "Breton genius," says Michelet, "is characterised by indomitable opposition and resistance." Among a host of names that might be mentioned, a few are given by Miss Betham-Edwards,† such as Abelard and Descartes, Laennec, who invented the stethoscope; and Broussais, the father of physiology in France; Jules Simon and Emile Souvestre; Latour d'Auvergne, student and soldier, whose heart, presented to Garibaldi, was carried by him into battle; Lamoriciere, Chateaubriand, Lamennais, and Renan. The ancient bards are represented by Briseux, a poet of the people; and by Viscomte de la Villemarqué, the Percy of Breton ballads.‡ As to Descartes, Dr. Veitch§ says, that "an elder brother was the first of the family to settle in Bretagne, so that it is a mistake to represent Descartes as a Breton. He was really descended from Poitou ancestry, though both father and elder brother were in the Bretagne parliament." It may be added, however,|| that the grandfather also sat in the same parliament, that the grandson narrowly escaped being born at Rennes, in Bretagne, because of the plague that caused his mother to flee, and that his infancy was spent there. Had he been a Breton, he would likely have added, to the speculative boldness of the thinker, the moral boldness of the Reformer. When he heard of the condemnation of Galileo (1633),

* See *Catholic Presbyterian* for April.

† "A Year in Western France."

‡ See his "Barzas-Breiz" (the Poetic History of Brittany), and some translations in Tom Taylor's "Songs and Ballads of Brittany."

§ "The Method, &c., of Descartes."

|| "Œuvres choisies de Descartes."—GARNIER.

he not only delayed the publication of his treatise *De Mundo*, but commenced to burn the manuscript.

The Arthurian element was introduced into Breton life at a critical period in the history of France. Nearly a century before—*i.e.*, about 450 A.D.—“Gaul was under the influence,” says Guizot,* “of three spiritual chiefs, Jerome, Augustine, and Paulin, none of whom lived there, though the last named was a Gaul by birth. It was they who really governed Gaulish Christianity, which addressed itself to them on all occasions, to receive ideas, solutions, counsels.” Nor were the Bretons behind the rest of their countrymen. A priest set forth from the heart of Brittany to carry into Palestine certain questions drawn up by two women on philosophical, historical, and religious matters. But by the beginning of the sixth century, the Teutons—Burgundians, Visigoths, and Franks—had overrun the whole of Gaul, except Brittany and the western part of Normandy adjoining. Armorica originally included Brittany and Normandy; but now, excepting the portions named, all Gaul was conquered by the barbarians. The Franks, who were the most savage of all, were settled in the North. Thus, when the Arthurian element was introduced into Brittany, all the rest of France was undergoing a social revolution. From this time, modern society began. The dead Arthur was thus destined to meet in France what he had met in Britain while alive—the old order changing, giving place to new. By the middle of this century, the Franks had overcome the other Teuton tribes and overrun the whole of Gaul, still excepting Brittany and part of Languedoc, the two portions of France in which modern literature was to spring. We have thus the conditions under which, in the South and North, an important element, intellectual and Christian, could be preserved undiluted, to mingle gradually with what was half-buried, but still alive, under the ruins of Roman civilisation and Gaulish Christianity; for the Teuton element, though barbarian and heathen, and exceedingly potent, was numerically small compared with the population. It was also possessed of elements full of a fresh and vigorous human life, easily assimilated with what was akin in Celtic life. Moreover, the Christian Church was an immense factor in the social change now begun. The Church was one, and contained much spiritual life, though with tendencies full of force to alter for the worse its doctrine and practice. It was, therefore, of vital importance that, at this crisis, an element in some respects new and full of vigour should be introduced, fitted to influence the moral and intellectual life of France, and even, by the more primitive type of British doctrine and discipline, to penetrate the teaching and practice of the native Church that were becoming lax and degenerate.

The state of France, therefore, at this period gives special importance to the advent of Columban there, towards the close of the sixth century. About the middle of the century, while still a young man, Columba founded, in Derry and at Durrow, institutions with a certain monastic

* “Hist. of Civilisation,” i.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

character, but not more monastic than was needed at the time for educational and missionary work. In 563, when forty-two years of age, he passed over to Iona, where he died in 597. One of his early disciples, Comgall, instituted the Irish Bangor, near the bay of Carrickfergus, and brought it to such a state of efficiency that it was famous over Europe. Here Columban and his friend Gall were trained, and at length designated to missionary work on the Continent. They seemed to have visited Columba at Iona in 588, spending a year or more with him for consultation and further training, and started on their mission about 590. Columban with twelve companions thus entered France fully imbued with what was best in the Early British Church; and we have direct evidence that he retained its characteristics of missionary zeal and simplicity of doctrine and worship, in direct opposition to the peculiarities of Rome with its growing ritual and ecclesiasticism. He was thus brought into conflict with Gregory the Great and Boniface IV., and a Synod was summoned in 602 to deliberate on the questions thus raised.* In these controversies he defended the ancient usages of the British Church, and spoke, wrote, and acted with the boldness of a later Reformer and the simple grandeur of an earlier Apostle. The centre of his work in France was Burgundy, first in the mountain forests of the Vosges, where he trained numerous disciples as good soldiers for his work, and later, in the plains, where the richest and noblest sent their sons to be under his tuition: even the king was in frequent communication with him. Of the twenty-five years he spent on the Continent, about twenty were passed in France, the remainder in planting missionary institutions in Zurich, Constance, and Geneva, and finally at Bobbio in North Italy, where he died in 615, "an object of veneration," says Guizot,† "to all the people among whom he had brought his tempestuous activity." He left in Switzerland his noble fellow-labourer Gall, who died in 640, after having raised up various missionary institutions and true-hearted successors, that were frequently joined by like-minded men from the Irish branch of the British Church.

The middle of the fourth century had seen in Martin, of Tours, still commemorated in Martinmas, one of the master-spirits of the age.‡ Ninian visited him before commencing his great work in North Britain, and Patrick spent four years with him in perfecting himself for his special work in Ireland. Martin died in 397; but his monastic institutions had seized on the most earnest minds of the time as the best fitted to form fortified camps and training-grounds for the soldiers of the cross. Early in the sixth century, another great spirit, Benedict, (born 480), sought to perfect the discipline of these institutions, which, even in France and North Italy, were then much more colleges for learning, with surrounding fields for healthy employment, than the monasteries of wealthy endowments and luxury in later days. All the

* Neander's "Church History," i.

† "Hist. of Civil," ii.

‡ Montalembert's "Monks of the West," ii.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

great missionaries of the British Church adopted this form of work, and the Rule of Columban was received in France before that of Benedict was introduced into that country.* Considerable prejudice has been felt against the Rule of Columban, because of the peculiar stringency of the discipline enjoined in the regulations under his name, and the minuteness with which strokes and stripes or psalms are adjudged to various trivial as well as grave breaches of monastic law.† But it is extremely doubtful whether anything more than the *Regula Columbanæ* is due to him. It contains ten heads full of wise and Scriptural principles.‡ The *Regula Cœnobialis Fratrum*, which contains, under fifteen heads, the “percussionibus” and “plagis,” very likely belongs to the later history of the institutions he founded, although called by his name.§ There was, no doubt, in the British institutions as well as in those that sprung from them elsewhere, a strict discipline kept up, as of soldiers in the field; and with hundreds and thousands of pupils, many of them raw or barbarous, the rod may have been necessary, as it is still thought needful in the great public schools of England; but in the division of the day between praying, learning, and labour, there was a wholesome humanity mixed with a primitive piety, which had little likeness to the emaciated monotony of the earlier anchorite, or the lazy rubicundity of the later monk. From this needful discipline, however, of the Columban schools, the minute castigations were no doubt formulated in after times. This devotion to labour, needful at first for sustentation and health, was the basis of that high development of art which distinguished the monasteries at a later period; and there is a curious instance of private punishment administered to an eavesdropper by Tuotilo, the artist-monk of St. Gall (died 912), which shows his familiarity with and his appreciation of occasional muscular discipline.||

It was thus, then, that Arthur passed, opening the way for such valiant knights as Columban and Gall, and other brethren from Britain and Ireland, for nearly a hundred years, girt with new weapons for new battle-fields. Brittany, Burgundy, Zurich, Geneva, Germany, and Bohemia, are the fields they occupied. The English, French, and others continued the work, carrying the Gospel into the north and south of pagan Europe;¶ and these were the famous scenes of great contests for

* Lanigan’s “Ecclesiastical History of Ireland.”

† *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, No. cii., 1877.

‡ Fleming’s “Collectanea Sacra.” § Reeve’s “Life of Columba.”

|| Tuotilo had been allowed to meet with two other monks for work in the evening. Their conversation having been overheard and reported, it was resolved to punish the spy. Radbert, one of the friends, was planted outside, while the others watched for the eavesdropper near the window. Suddenly, Tuotilo, who was of immense strength, seized him by the collar and drew him half into the cell, while his friend applied the proper punishment from without, till the cries of the sufferer brought relief and release.—Keane’s “Early Teutonic, Italian, and French Masters.”

¶ Maclear’s “Missions of the Middle Ages.”

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

truth and righteousness in other days. But before we touch on some of these, let us recall another great revolution that befell the north of France.

In the first half of the tenth century, the Northmen seized on a large portion of Armorica, Brittany still remaining intact. "The Norman Conquest," says Freeman, "stands without a parallel in any other Teutonic land. It is not a beginning of history, but a turning-point. It brought a most extensive foreign infusion, affecting blood, language, laws, arts—only an infusion, however, for the older and stronger elements survived and made good their supremacy."* This Norman element became largely imbued with the Arthurian, so that, when the Normans landed in England in the eleventh century, they were no longer heathen, but Christian,—no longer Northmen, but French. The foreign element was absorbed into the native, and thus Arthur came again to Britain with the Normans, not only with sword and song, but, as Malory says, "to win the holy cross"—to drop the carnal weapons for the spiritual, and, under new forms, to set forth in substance the sign of the Son of Man.

There can be no question that, amidst all the turbulence of civil life for centuries before the Reformation, or the growing secularity and doctrinal corruption of the Church, there was a real primitive piety preserved over Europe among clergy and laity, in some places a cluster of God-fearing families, and here and there, suddenly appearing, a spirit of apostolic ardour. The fields cultured by the men I have named were specially marked by such greenness and fruitfulness ages after they were gone. These fields, as they whitened into harvest in successive seasons, were often trampled down and covered with mire; but patches at least were reclaimed and preserved for fresh seed-times. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was the greatest harvest of all. The revival of learning from the twelfth to the end of the fourteenth century; the work of the mystics and the invention of printing in the fifteenth; and the struggle of the French Kings with the Popes for the Gallican liberties in the beginning of the sixteenth, all prepared the way. When the Reformation itself broke out, it was found in the old fields of earlier missionary labour, especially Burgundy. In France we find the first Reformer is Farel, from the neighbourhood of Languedoc; then Lefevre, from Picardy, in the neighbourhood of Normandy; Briçonnet, from St. Malo; the noble band in Lyons; and finally, another child of Picardy, John Calvin, who, in passing to Geneva, met the ancient British Church in John Knox. Knox went to Geneva, not from North Britain, but from England, where for five years, after his captivity in France, he preached in the counties of Northumberland, Durham, and Cumberland, a region which had been the very heart of the early British Church in Arthur's time; and for the greater part of the five following years, he was in contact with

* Freeman's "Norman Conquest," i.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

English exiles at Frankfort and Geneva. He was thus in his fifty-fifth year when he landed in Scotland, ripe and ready for his final work there. He had ministered to Wishart before his martyrdom as he went about preaching from place to place; and thus, like his master, became an ardent admirer of the Helvetic Churches before he met Calvin. Wishart had visited these Churches and translated their Confession, which became in 1537 the First Confession of the Scottish Church.* Thus Knox, like Calvin, was intensely penetrated by the spirit of the early British Church, especially in the old Arthurian love of civil liberty, as well as in love of Holy Scripture and of a simple, Scriptural, Church organisation; and in this last feature showed a contrast to the special defect of Luther.†

The flight of the Huguenots to England is another form in which Arthur, in disaster and death, comes here, as before he passed to France, "to heal him of his grievous wound." And although France was almost laid bare to the rock by the most base and atrocious of persecutions, yet the rise of the Jansenists in the seventeenth century, and of their successors in the eighteenth, shows that the good ground was not all swept away, nor the good seed with it. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, the ancient Presbyterian Church of France, which had once 2150 congregations, never wholly extinct, though fearfully decimated, was restored to something of its primitive organisation;‡ and in this present century, the mission of the Welsh Presbyterians in Brittany,§ and the evangelistic work that is taking such extensive hold of Paris, may suggest to the heirs of early evangelism now in Britain and America, two fields in France that invite their modern enterprise and challenge their ancient heroism.

DUGALD MACCOLL.

THE CONFLICT OF CHRISTIANITY WITH HEATHENISM.

THE Protestant Church at large, and not less the Catholic Presbyterian Church, owes thanks to Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn for his noble work on the "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism;" and English-speaking Christians are indebted to Professor Egbert C. Smith, of Andover Theological Seminary, and the Rev. C. J. H. Ropes, of Ellsworth, Maine, for their admirable translation of the work into English. The field covered by Dr. Uhlhorn's work is old and familiar to all students of Church history; but he has given it a new interest by a concentration of the facts of the great "Conflict," and by the addition of many new

* Lorimer's "John Knox and the Church of England."

† D'Aubigné's "Reformation in the Time of Calvin."

‡ "Report of First Presb. Council, 1877," p. 295.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

facts, brought to light by his own researches and the researches of other eminent scholars during the last few years.

The work has a special interest to Presbyterians, because Dr. Uhlhorn, though a Lutheran minister, concedes—as does also the learned Bishop of Durham, Dr. Lightfoot—that the Churches planted by the apostles, and for several generations afterwards, were Presbyterian in their organisation. The Conflict, therefore, of Christianity with Heathenism, during the first century and much of the second, was waged under the blue flag of Christian Presbyterianism. The persecutions under Nero, Domitian, Trajan, and Hadrian, were Presbyterian persecutions, not because the Christians were Presbyterians, but because the Presbyterians were Christians. It is most satisfactory to know that those who suffered and died for their faith were Christians; but it is also satisfactory, though in a less degree, to know that they were Presbyterians. “From the first,” says Dr. Uhlhorn (pp. 349, 350), “the church had a polity; church offices had always existed. To imagine the churches as at any time without administration and organisation would be entirely unhistorical. Where the apostles founded churches, they also appointed officers. These were called *Presbyters*, that is, *Elders*; or what had then the same meaning, *Bishops*, that is, *Overseers*. Every church had several of these officials; no single person stood at the head of the Church, but a college of equal elders had sway. Their office was primarily to rule, but of course it naturally came to pass that the duty of building up the Church in doctrine was committed to them, since they, as the most prominent members, were best fitted for the task. In addition to the eldership, but subordinate to it, was the office of *Deacon*, that is, *Servant*. The eldership, however, was only a local, not an ecclesiastical office, that is, it related only to the local church, not to the Church at large. The organisation of the churches remained in this simple condition after the apostolic age and into the second century. Few forms were needed, because the Spirit was still present in fulness of life and power, while the churches were small, and all their relations were simple. With the first decade of the second century, however, an important change came about, not at one time in all the local churches, still less by any common decision, but by an inward necessity, which made itself felt simultaneously in different localities. Some one of the presbyter-bishops was raised from among his peers to be the leader, and to him, with the thenceforth restricted title of bishop, the government of the church was confided; so that there were officers of three grades,—a single bishop, and a plurality of elders and of deacons. In this new form, the episcopal office was still only over the local church.” In other words, under the rule of the apostles, the churches were each governed by a session of presbyters or elders, one, or more, or all of whom taught the church, that is, preached to it, as occasion required; but afterwards, when the apostles were dead, it was found to be more for edification that some one in particular of the session should be

set apart to the work of preaching, and should be installed as the bishop, pastor, or minister of each individual church, and, in conjunction with the other elders, should rule the congregation. This was Presbyterianism pure and simple; and this was the condition and character of the early Church for more than a century,—in fact, for almost two centuries,—after the crucifixion of Christ. It was not till the “middle of the third century” that “the episcopal office meets us in its full maturity as an ecclesiastical office.” Thus, as the Bishop of Durham puts it, Presbytery was not derived from Episcopacy, but Episcopacy from Presbytery. And, as “the episcopal office in its full maturity” does not meet us till “the middle of the third century,” before which Presbytery was the rule and order of the Church, it follows that the conflict of Christianity with heathenism was waged mainly by Presbyterians. To us who love the old Presbyterian Church, and glory in her many labours, sufferings, and triumphs, this gives additional interest to the great three-hundred-year-long conflict which ended in the consummate victory of the Church over heathenism.

Dr. Uhlhorn opens his noble narrative by calling attention to the fact stated by Melito of Sardis, that Christianity was born at the same time with the Roman empire; and also to the preparation, afforded by the universality of the empire, for the spread of Christianity. The empire embraced almost the whole of the then known world. From Rome, great military and commercial highways radiated to the most distant parts of the empire. Along these highways, from the Atlantic to beyond the Tigris, and from the frozen north in Europe to the sunny south in Africa, towns and cities were clustered; while over them passed a constant stream of traders, travellers, and soldiers, all under the protection of the Emperor. Christianity had thus a free and safe access to the peoples of all nationalities within the empire. Without this, it had been impossible, humanly speaking, for the apostles to obey the command of Christ, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel. At the same time, Jews of the dispersion were already scattered and colonised in all the important towns and cities clustered along the military highways, having in every place their synagogues, or places “where prayer was wont to be made.” This secured preaching-places for the apostles and evangelists wherever they might go, and we have but to read the book of the Acts to see the use they made of this advantage. As they were Jews, their first inquiry, on entering any new city, would be for the Jews’ quarter; and immediately, on the Sabbath day, in the synagogue, or at the place of prayer (availing themselves of every Jew’s privilege in such places), they made known their message—proving from the Scriptures, first, that it was necessary that the Christ should die as a sacrifice for sin, and rise from the dead; and, second, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ. If their message was received and believed, that Jewish synagogue became a Christian church; if it was rejected, they turned to the Gentiles, preached the Gospel to them, and organised churches

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

out of the converts from the "devout" heathen men and women who were found hovering round the synagogues. These were the providential preparations for the evangelisation of the world.

But these were merely the first successful beginnings for the conversion of the world—small cleared and prepared spots in the wilderness, where the seed of the Gospel could be planted, and where it could spread, grow, and ripen to its harvest. The great work, the work of clearing away the wilderness of heathenism itself, and planting Christianity in its stead, was yet to be done. In the way of this, there were gigantic obstructions, and it is in the discussion of them that the chief interest of Dr. Uhlhorn's work lies.

One of these obstructions was the *universal prevalence of a false religion*, which had lost its power as a faith, but retained its power as a superstition—a religion that was even more to the Greek and the Roman, as a dead superstition, than the dead superstition of Roman Catholicism is to the Italian and the Spaniard. At the time of Paul's visit to Athens, the Athenians, it is stated, worshipped thirty thousand gods. Petronius said, "Our country is so peopled with gods that it is easier to find a god than a man." "The whole world was full of gods; their temples rose in all places,—large and splendid edifices and little chapels, in cities and villages, in field and forest, on the verge of the wilderness, and on the summits of mountains." "Sacred trees, stones, and rocks were decked with garlands and ribbons, and no one passed by them without some sign of reverence." "The State was founded upon religion. At every important public transaction, the gods were consulted, sacrifices offered, and religious rites observed. And as the entire State, so every community, every city, every circle of cities had its special cult, well-founded institutions, rich and distinguished colleges for priests, and special feast-days and sacrifices. In the same way, all domestic and family life had a religious tone. Each period of life, every important event, was celebrated with religious services. There was the goddess Lucina, who watched over the birth of a child; Rumina attended to its nursing; Nundina was invoked on the ninth day, when the name was given; Potina, or Edusa, accustomed it to eat and drink. The day when the child first stepped on the ground was consecrated to Statanus; Abeona taught it to walk; Cunina averted evil enchantments while it was lying in the cradle. There was a god of the door (Forculus), a god of the threshold (Limentinus), a goddess of the hinges (Cardea). From the niche of a rafter, Epona, the goddess of horses, looked down upon the stable; on the ship stood the image of Neptune; the merchants prayed to Mercury for successful bargains. All tillage of the soil began with prayer." So was it through the whole of political, social, domestic, commercial, mechanical, and agricultural life. There were gods everywhere, and for everything. Worship abounded on all sides, in public and in private. Religion was a ruling characteristic in the habitual daily life of the people. And yet, as we shall see, the old-time faith in

the gods was dead, the worship paid them was a lifeless form, and the religion they inculcated was a non-regenerating superstition. But, nevertheless, the power of this superstition in all its multitudinous forms, associated and blended as it was with the whole life of the people, arrayed itself in bitter, relentless hostility to the Gospel.

Another obstacle lay in the *riches and luxury of the ruling classes*, in and about Rome, Athens, Corinth, Alexandria, Ephesus, Antioch, and the other principal cities of the Empire. Roman conquests had harvested the riches of the world and gathered them into her garner. The luxury in which the ruling classes lived is almost incredible; it has never been equalled, or even approached in any subsequent age by any other people. Augustus boasted that he found Rome brick, and left it marble; and from his time onward through several centuries, not only public buildings, but also private dwellings showed unparalleled magnificence. A private residence was considered humble and mean if it were not, in size and elegance, comparable to many a modern palace, and surrounded by at least four acres of superbly adorned lands and gardens. "Beams of Hymettian marble rested on pillars from Africa; the walls were formed of costly slabs of variegated marble, or of alabaster, bordered with green serpentine brought from distant Egypt or from the Black Sea. The arches glistened with mosaics, the floors were artistically tessellated. In the intervening spaces were green shrubberies and plashing fountains; while high above, for protection from the sun, a crimson awning stretched from one pillared roof to another, suffusing the mosaic floor and the mossy carpet with a rosy shimmer." *Ex uno disce omnia*. The furnishing corresponded with the residence: "expensive tables with covers of citrus wood and resting on ivory feet; couches inlaid with gold and silver, and covered with Babylonian tapestry; splendid vases of Corinthian bronze, or the somewhat enigmatical Murtha (vessels made of which were worth \$7,500, and even \$37,500), Æginetan candelabra, sideboards with antique silver plate, and statues and paintings by renowned artists. Every thing, even down to the common household utensils, was, in an incomparably higher degree than with us, artistically formed and finished."

And the life within was correspondingly luxurious. "Inordinate longing for enjoyment, effeminacy, and voluptuousness reigned supreme. Entertainments and feasts chased one another, each in turn more *recherché* than the preceding. The means of enjoyment were gathered from every quarter of the globe; and the more rare and costly they were, the more highly they were prized. Men outvied each other in the art of squandering, at a single meal, hundreds of thousands of sesterces. That the pleasure of eating might be prolonged, emetics were used." Seneca said, "They vomit to eat, and eat to vomit." Thousands were expended in a single day for flowers—roses and violets in the middle of winter—which were showered upon the guests, and for ointments and fragrant waters. In everything there was exaggeration, even to unnaturalness;

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

and our belief is often taxed as though we were in an enchanted castle, where, as fairy tales relate, every thing is of silver and gold." Space will not permit a description of Nero's "Golden House," whose colonnades were each a mile long, and whose halls and saloons were overlaid with gold and adorned with precious stones; nor can we speak of the feasting, drinking, and revelling therein, nor of the journey of his queen, Poppæa Sabina, with five hundred she-asses, that she might take her daily baths in their milk.

As was inevitable from a decay of faith and a growth of luxury, there was a *loss of morality*—a third obstacle to the spread of the Gospel. Some have thought Paul's description of the moral condition of the heathen world in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans overdrawn; but all his statements there, and in other of his Epistles, are more than confirmed in the writings of the heathen themselves. The heathen world was morally debased to the level of the brute beast—was rotten to the core. Exceptions there were, of course, and in the aggregate a good many; but of the mass of the people, the horrid and appalling truth stands as Paul states it. Roman historians, moralists, and poets declare it, and uncovered Pompeii reveals it. Dishonesty, venality, lying, fraud, cruelty, licentiousness, unnatural lusts, were common, and were openly practised without shame. Seneca, the moralist, whose moralisings are very beautiful to read, was himself shamelessly immoral, and encouraged the grosser immoralities of his pupil Nero. He discoursed eloquently upon the excellency of a Stoic contempt for riches, but took care to amass for himself, in four years of prosperity, a fortune of \$15,000,000. He wrote a treatise on poverty, though at the time his palatial residence was fitted up with every elegance, and filled with all conceivable luxuries, among which were "five hundred citrus tables"—tables of veined wood from Mount Athos—each costing from \$25,000 to \$75,000. And this was one of the best of the Romans—false, luxurious, licentious, selfish. Again we say: *Ex uno disce omnes*.

But hear what he says of others, and of his times. "All things are full of iniquity and vice. More crimes are committed than can be remedied by force. A monstrous contest of wickedness is carried on. Daily the lust of sin increases; daily the sense of shame diminishes. Casting away all regard for what is good and honourable, pleasure runs riot without restraint. Vice no longer hides itself; it stalks forth before all eyes: so public has iniquity become, so mightily does it flame up in all hearts, that innocence is now rare—nay, it has ceased to exist." Seneca, it will be remembered, was a contemporary of Paul, and a brother of that Gallio, "deputy of Achaia," before whom Paul was brought at Corinth. We might quote Tacitus, and Juvenal, and Suetonius, and many others, in proof of the utter moral rottenness of the Roman world at that time, but we forbear.

Further proof, however, of heathen immorality may be seen in the

position and condition of women, children, and slaves. Regarding woman as wife, the question which Socrates asked of one of his friends in Athens four hundred years previously, exactly suits the heathen world at the time of Christ—viz.: "Is there a human being with whom you talk less than with your wife?" So also does the remark of Demosthenes, "We have *hetærae* for our pleasure, wives to bear us children and to care for our households." The natural result of putting the wife into such a position of degradation and shame was, that she became immoral and shameless. Dr. Uhlhorn declares that "domestic chastity and morality almost wholly disappeared." Seneca says: "There are women who count their years, not by the number of consuls, but by the number of their husbands." Juvenal says: "They allow themselves to be divorced before the nuptial garlands are faded." Seneca says again: "Marriage is only contracted because adultery affords a new and piquant charm." Such being the relations of husbands and wives, and such the immoralities of wives and mothers, children were naturally regarded as an encumbrance and a nuisance. "Infanticide, and a yet more shameful practice, were not regarded as crimes." New-born babes were "exposed," flung into the Tiber, and otherwise got rid of. The children that were suffered to live were handed over to the care and companionship of slaves. "Mothers were more concerned about their toilets, or what flute or cithara player would receive the crown in the next contest, what horse would win at the next race, what athlete or gladiator would come off victorious in the amphitheatre, than they were about the education of their children."

The position of slaves in a demoralised society such as this could not be doubtful—they were classed among the brute beasts. If they received consideration, it was only as a man was considerate for his ox or his ass. Even Varro and Cicero did not rise above this estimate of the slave. Varro classes slaves with oxen, with this superiority, that they could talk. Cicero apologises for some feeling shown over the death of a favourite slave as if he had been a favourite dog; and he speaks of the crucifixion of a slave by his master for a trifling mistake in a boar hunt as "*perhaps* harsh." "As porters, they were chained in front of the gate, as we do with a house-dog, and at night were shut up in the *ergastula*, like animals in stalls." "When they died, they were cast into a pit with dead animals—unless, indeed, they had been previously exchanged, according to Cato's advice, for old oxen or cows." Naturally, being treated as brute beasts, they became as brute beasts—stupid, like the ox; cunning, like the fox; vicious, like the mule; savage, like the wolf. The large class of freedmen who, having served as soldiers, and for other reasons, had been manumitted, were, as a class, scarcely better than the slaves, and received but little more consideration. "The mechanics' occupation," said Cicero, "is degrading: a workshop is incompatible with anything noble."

This brief survey will give us some idea of the immensity of the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

obstacles in the way of the spread of the Gospel in the Roman heathen world,—an existing “religion,” omnipresent and permeating everything, that was not a religion of life, but a superstition of death ; a “luxury” that appealed to all the senses, that gratified every taste, that subsidised every faculty ; an “immorality” that obliterated the spiritual sense in man, that demoralised woman, that shamed the child, that degraded the slave. And these were not the only obstacles. That the heathen should oppose the Gospel was natural ; the opposition of the Jew, however, was unnatural. With a few exceptions, the Jews, numbering hundreds of thousands, probably a million or more (Dr. Uhlhorn thinks there were 50,000 in Rome alone) and scattered all over the Empire, opposed the Gospel with a determination and a bitterness that were rare among the Gentiles. Some of the fiercest persecutions of the Church were instigated and fanned into flames by Jews. The martyrdom of that heroic Presbyterian pastor of the Church at Smyrna, Polycarp, a disciple of John, was instigated by Jews ; while Stoicism, and Epicureanism, and Platonism, and Neo-Platonism, and Gnosticism, and many other “isms,” were all arrayed against the Gospel in determined hostility. From any merely human point of view, the obstacles in the way of the Gospel in the heathen world were insurmountable.

But into this world the Gospel entered, and entered it to conquer it for Christ, not with carnal weapons, but by the power of the Spirit through the foolishness of preaching. Its successes were small at first, and for the most part among the insignificant classes of the people—slaves, freedmen, women, and children. “Not many mighty, not many noble were called.” The mass of Christians, for two centuries, in the Christian churches scattered over the Empire, were from the despised common people. There were some converts from the classes of the rich and the distinguished, but comparatively, there were not many. Still, the Gospel went forward, slowly and painfully winning its way. Constantly more or less persecuted, and suffering ten general and bloody persecutions (when thousands were beheaded, crucified, burnt at the stake, torn to pieces by wild beasts, tortured and imprisoned), it recruited and went forward. Pitied, scorned, despised, ridiculed, it still went forward. And at last, after a three-hundred-year-long conflict, it became victorious, when Constantine proclaimed Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire.

Let us, in conclusion, emphasise the fact that in the earlier years of this great conflict, under the Apostles and the first of the Fathers of the Church—when the Christian converts were purest in doctrine and soundest in the faith ; when the most heroic sacrifices were made, and the greatest sufferings were endured, and the noblest heroism was manifested,—the Church was clearly and distinctively Presbyterian. The Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, and Rome were Presbyterian churches. The Christian martyrs under Nero, Domitian, Trajan, and Hadrian, were Presbyterian martyrs. There

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

were then none but Presbyterian Churches in the world. They were not Presbyterian merely in name, but in organisation and in fact. We do not mention this to glory in it, except so far as to thank God for a church lineage that runs back to Christ and His Apostles ; and to praise Him, that, in the baptism of blood through which she was called to pass in order to conquer the world for Christ, she did not deny the faith, but sealed her testimony with her blood.

FRED. T. BROWN.

THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED BRETHREN.

CHURCH historians, tracing the course of the Bohemian Reformation, have too commonly supposed that the noble work begun by Huss ended with the overthrow of the Taborites and the disappearance of the Calixtines. But there is a third offshoot from the original stock. This is the *Unitas Fratrum*, or Church of the United Brethren, in whom are beautifully blended the best features of the various branches of Hussitism—the utmost catholicity of spirit, earnest attachment to the Scriptures, strict purity of life and discipline, intense energy, unflinching zeal, dauntless readiness to suffer persecution, and courage to separate from Rome. The year 1157 may be taken as that in which this body was fully formed, though its first beginnings date from 1434, of bloody memory, when Hussite enthusiasm took a new direction. Till then, the Bohemian Protestant had obtained his spiritual food in the camp : there stood his pulpit, and there the questions of the day were discussed. But with the advent of peace, he returned to his own hearth, where, while his leaders slept in the gory soil of the battlefield, or were engaged in hopeless wrangling with Rome, he began to meditate on the causes of the horrible past, on what had been lost and gained in the vicissitudes of his country's recent history, and he sank deep into doubt and despondency. Thus the spiritual condition of the people was one of extreme suffering ; many were distracted in their helplessness to answer the question, What is truth ?

Just at this time there arose one who carefully observed the sore soul-sickness that prevailed, and who found out the cure. "Though not a master of the seven arts, he was a practical example of the eight beatitudes : " such is the epitaph inscribed to his memory by a grateful posterity. It is also written, "He was full of the Holy Ghost ; " but the Jesuits, who burned his works, declare him to have been "one of the greatest blasphemers, full of the spirit of the Devil, a destroyer of the Church, a lawless demagogue." This criticism, however, forms the strongest stimulus to look at the man—Peter of Khelchizze, long known merely by name and dim tradition, till recent discovery has thrown more light upon his character and history. But the mere perusal of his works

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

shows him to have been a man of powerful and original mind ; new and remarkable ideas are presented upon every page.

It may be assumed that Peter belonged to the smaller gentry—freeholders of small estates, who, though they had enough to lead a comfortable life, were prevented, by want of sufficient means, from taking part in the chivalrous exploits of the knights. He was born in 1390, and though educated at the University, proved but a poor Latin scholar ; yet this very deficiency the more clearly exhibits his originality. He was acquainted with all the leading men of the Reformation, especially among the Taborites ; and under his hospitable roof there found shelter two bitter antagonists—Rokyzzana, who fled from Sigismund, and Peter Payne, when banished by the diet of Kutná Hora. In 1419, he separated from the Reformers on account of the decision pronounced by the University regarding the lawfulness of defending the faith by the sword. Thenceforward, he lived in rural retirement, broken sometimes both by Taborite and Calixtine priests who came to him for light. He spent his time in composing books, and in social intercourse with a select company of kindred spirits ; and died probably about the year 1457. Of his works, seventeen are still extant, the chief of which are his "Postilla," written 1434-36, and his "Net of Faith," completed in 1455 ; these give a fair view of his opinions, and, if republished, would form profitable material for study to the whole Christian Church.

There was no other man then living in Bohemia, not even among the Taborites, who would have had the courage to express himself as Peter did regarding the demands made by the nation, and the losses it had suffered. "Everything hitherto done," he writes, "has been in vain ; we must begin anew. What effect has all the blood, shed in so many battles, produced upon the *man* ? What do the treaties with Rome and with Sigismund avail us, if our souls are speeding down to perdition ? It is too true that Christ is dead in the people, and that His faith and all its benefits are lost, because the priests have become so many dumb dogs, caring more for their bellies and fat tables than for human souls. There, in Constance and Basle, they have been for many years pondering and planning how to make a fool of Christ, the poor and gentle Saviour, and to make themselves the heirs of worldly pleasures. What do you expect from those who call themselves the Church, the authority ? Away with it ! An authority that is called upon to mend its rags and reform itself is no longer an authority ! It is a den of sin. Away with your unions and pacts ! A union of fools, beguiled or conscious sinners, is worse than discord. What we need now is witness for Christ. It is sin, the common enemy of mankind, that we must fight against, and the victory may be gained without cruel wars and oppression. There remains but one course open—a speedy return to the practice of Christ and His apostles. Unite with Him ; join in an earnest, real, Christian life ; cling to the Gospel."

In the "Net of Faith" he is still more pointed. "Do not listen to

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

what men say, but look to Christ, the Almighty Judge, the Saviour of every believer—for nowhere else is salvation to be found. Yet you are taught to look for it in ceremonies, confessions, priests, pope, and so forth. The pope a saviour! Do you not see that he forgives sins by imposing penitence on people's pence? If we are saved, it is not through our merits, but on account of the inexhaustible mercy of our Lord. No one can deserve salvation; it is a gift of grace. And Christ asks nothing for it but our heart. Everything else you see and hear is a trick of the Devil, and dates from the conversion of Constantine. For a voice was then heard: To-day is poison poured into the Church! The priest did not teach the sovereign the humility of Christ, but the sovereign taught the priest to revel in fleshly lusts. Then heathen customs and ordinances thronged into the kingdom of Christ, and charity with simplicity gave way to tyranny, pride, and insolence. Priests and lords divide the spoils. The meek are cuffed and the poor are flayed. Men of wealth and might buy their fellows like cattle, and feed upon their sufferings, though they profess to believe that Christ bought all for Himself with His precious blood. But remember, every soul has the same price; all men are alike in the sight of God. And the true worship of God is the service of a pure heart. If a soul is tainted with sin, it must return to God with unfeigned repentance and faith."

These passages may suffice to show what kind of man Peter was—verily a Reformer before the Reformation. If the printing-press had been at his disposal, he might have shattered to pieces the schemes of Popery. As it is, we need not wonder that such a practical theologian became the founder of a practical Church.

It has been already stated that there were many distressed souls throughout Bohemia; small communities of these were formed in Vilemov, Leitomischl, Kolín, &c., but it was in Prague that the new Church had its cradle. Thither returned Rokyzzana from a self-imposed exile in 1450; and having imbibed Peter's ideas during his stay with him, he preached powerfully against the corruptions of Rome, and warned his fellow-countrymen against the danger of uniting with her. Of the small band of inquirers who gathered round him, the chief was Gregor, formerly a monk, but now a tailor, though but little more is known regarding him. He is said to have been a "pious and intelligent man, humble and austere, active and courageous, who cared neither for honour nor riches, and who, without being a scholar, surpassed many in his power of wielding tongue and pen." For seven years the little flock continued to listen to the discourses of Rokyzzana, who also placed Peter's books in their hands. Gregor could not rest till he saw Peter, whose principles he then embraced with his whole heart. Deeply convinced that he and his friends could now no longer remain within the pale of either of the existing Churches, he besought Rokyzzana to become their leader in the formation of a new body. But, as circum-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

stances had now begun to change with the accession of George of Podebrad, and the fortunes of Utraquism promised well, Rokyzzana declined the honour of "sharing shame" with the others, but at the same time—whether out of regard for them, or with the view of getting rid of them—obtained for them permission from George to settle on his own devastated estate of Kunwald. Here, too, the other scattered Hussite communities repaired, and formed the *Unity*, or Church of the United Brethren, which rapidly increased in numbers. At the very first, it counted about twenty preachers who had served in Taborite or Orebite camps, and had some protectors among the nobles. But it had soon to pass through persecution, and stand on its defence. No Christian Church has ever put forth so many Apologies and Confessions; within 160 years, there appeared no less than fifty editions of its symbolical books.

In the year 1461 were published many Taborite tracts which sorely tried the patience of the doctors at the University. These tracts appeared also to be forebodings of a political movement among the fragments of that denomination. To quell the disturbance, King George resorted to severe measures, and forbade meetings to be held. Gregor, however, called a meeting of the Brethren in Prague, but the secret was divulged by a traitor. All safely escaped except three, including Gregor. The functionary who apprehended them, himself probably a member of another pious sect, the "Grey Friars," entered the room with the words, "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. Follow me to prison." Those who had been seized were cruelly tortured, and an edict was immediately issued against the whole community; the colony in Kunwald was broken up, and the members betook themselves to the woods and the mountains; those who were caught were compelled to profess Utraquism. In their distress, the Brethren looked for help to Rokyzzana, but he remained deaf to their entreaties, and they had to drink the first cup of persecution to its dregs. They were finally driven into Moravia, but before this, in 1464, were able to hold an assembly in the forest of Rychnov, where they agreed on the course of conduct they were to pursue—to continue submissive, humble, patient, and pure, to obey and to pray for those in authority, and to labour honestly so as to become able to afford help to suffering brethren.

But during the rage of a new war between the Utraquists and the Pope, the Brethren were allowed to take breath, and were for a time forgotten. The favourable opportunity thus afforded was embraced for the purpose of holding a new Assembly in the village of Lhota (1467), at which about seventy were present, both from Bohemia and Moravia. Two important matters were discussed—the ordination of priests, and the constitution of the Church. The priests who had hitherto ministered among them were now advanced in years, and were rapidly passing away. All of them had received Roman ordination; hence, so long as they remained, the Brethren could stand unblushingly before other churches; but it had been affirmed that when they had passed away, the Church of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

the Unity would die too. But, acting on the kind hint thrown out by an intelligent Utraquist, that they should "follow the example of the Primitive Church, and ordain their ministers themselves," they selected the names of nine men whom they deemed worthy of the office; out of this number, after much earnest prayer, three were drawn by lot and ordained, with kissing and the imposition of hands.

The scheme of church government was also sketched in outline at Lhota, though not completed till 1496; it was revised and modified in 1616, to render it somewhat more acceptable to other Protestants who then formally united with them in an Evangelical Church of Bohemia. In the preamble it is declared that there are, in the Church, things essential, ministerial, and accidental. The essentials are, the grace of God, the merits of Christ, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit; the ministerials are, the Word of God, Church power, and the sacraments; the accidentals are concerned with the time, place, and mode of administering these: regarding the last, the Brethren declare themselves ready to accept anything better than what may have been previously followed.

Their congregations contained three different classes of members,—*beginners*, including children and recent converts; *proficients*, who made public profession and conformed to the discipline; *perfects*, or those tending to perfection, who were strong in faith, love, and hope. Out of this last class were elected the elders—grave and pious men chosen by the whole congregation, whose duty it was to warn and reprove, to exercise discipline, and to aid the pastor in his work. Similarly, pious matrons were chosen to perform like offices among members of their own sex. The elders were divided into three classes,—ruling elders; almoners, who cared for the poor, sick, orphans, and persecuted members; and treasurers, who attended to the material wants of the congregation, such as church and manse building, and to the contributions of the members.

The ministers, who were all equal in rank and authority, were long accustomed to lead a celibate life: every one learned a trade, so as to be able to support himself in times of persecution. To prepare others for the ministry, each pastor watched the children of his congregation, and took the most gifted and promising into his house, where they were taught the Bible, the Catechism, and the sciences, and helped the pastor in teaching others when they themselves grew older. When visiting the congregation, or travelling, the pastor had always two of these attendants with him, that they might learn from his example. They were also sent to those of the congregation who lived at a distance, to offer prayer and read the Scriptures to the people. After they had in this way learned all that they could gain from one pastor, the young men were sent to another who could teach them more, till, having proved their ability, they were made deacons or probationers, and allowed to preach and baptise. In later times, the deacons were often married men, and persons of vast experience, for there never was

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

among them any haste to become ordained ministers. Before ordination, it was necessary that they should be proposed by elders of the congregation among which they had laboured, and pass three examinations.

The whole Church was divided into districts, each having a synod, with a *senior* at its head. This officer was chosen by all the pastors of the district, and retained his position for life, unless deposed by the General Assembly, which met every third year, when the oldest senior presided. Those entitled to vote were the ministers, elders, patrons, owners of estates, and members of the Unity. The debates were opened by the youngest, and closed by the oldest deputies. The General Assembly was the supreme court, from which there could be no appeal; it also received foreign delegates, and examined, ordained, and appointed ministers. In this oversight of congregations especially, the Unity was very strict: in cases where opposition was raised, no pastor was appointed at all, but great care was taken in endeavouring to send the proper man to the proper place.

The duties and responsibilities of the senior were great, and the exercise of his power sometimes dangerous; his zeal often became the motive-principle of the whole community. It was his to watch over purity of doctrine and morals, to exhort his brother ministers, to inspect congregations, to superintend libraries and education generally, to write apologies in defence of the Church; and he was frequently engaged in travel, night and day. The whole of the seniors, together with some elders—twelve or thirteen members—formed the executive of the General Assembly.

The ritual of the United Brethren was very simple. On Sabbath, they met several times, to sing, pray, and hear a sermon. Baptism was performed by pouring the water; in the Lord's Supper, the people received the elements either standing or kneeling. Special rules of conduct were laid down for the different classes of members, but all pointed to one end—to follow Jesus and glorify His name. There were three degrees of discipline—private admonition, reproof before the elders, and major and minor excommunication. Their places of worship were plain and unadorned. They were averse to military service, and to every profession that might endanger the conscience; they also disapproved of any connection of their Church with the State.

Though the Brethren kept their proceedings secret, these somehow soon transpired; Rokyzana took this as an insult, and indeed he became estranged from them. Now, too, the Utraquists preached and wrote against them, and put forward a vagrant who pretended penitence for having been a senior among the Brethren, and told horrible and abominable stories to turn the public mind against them. But the contrary effect was produced when the imposter's clumsy falsehoods were discovered; the people thronged to the Brethren for instruction, and many nobles and citizens sought admission to their communion.

This outward growth necessarily brought about some change in their tenets. Up to this point, Peter's views had been their standard, and threatened to dwarf all progress. For instance, no room had been made for nobles or citizens, who were regarded as having tasted the poisoned wine of the world ; but this view, of course, now became untenable. Moreover, the scholars who had been admitted, having a deeper and broader view of life, craved reform ; but the older members held to those primitive rules which had been the very means of making the Unity attractive to those recent entrants who now wished some change. Just at this juncture, Lukas, a young bachelor of Prague, who had found peace to his soul among the Brethren, pointed out the obstacle to a mutual understanding in the contradiction between the doctrine of personal merit and that of justification by faith. It has been common among Church historians to represent Luther as the first great champion of this latter doctrine ; but, in truth, it cannot be mistaken wherever the Bible is read and studied carefully. The extent to which the United Brethren shared in the elucidation of this tenet is best shown in one of their apologies, dating from 1503 : this tract is wholly occupied with a statement of the doctrine.

In a conference, proposed by Lukas, and held at Brandys, the young party pledged itself to teach strictly in the Biblical sense. A disruption, however, would certainly have taken place, had not both parties agreed to consult other Churches before coming to a final decision. Having heard of the fabulous Prester John in Asia, they sent four deputies, one of whom was Lukas, to learn his views on the subject in dispute. After passing through Poland on their perilous journey, they separated at Constantinople, when Lukas made for Greece ; others went to Russia, Armenia, and the Turkish provinces of Asia, while one turned towards India, Egypt, and Palestine. Years were spent in this unique search after justification by faith, but when at last they returned, wearied and disappointed, from their fruitless inquiry after the fabled umpire, they were astonished to find the doctrine flourishing at home ! In 1494, it was embraced by the whole General Assembly, except a worthy veteran called Amos, who seceded.

In their loneliness, the Brethren gladly listened to every sound that seemed like the truth, and welcomed every ray of light that pierced the darkness. Having learned about so many other Churches through their deputies, they felt an intense desire to see the Waldenses. Now and then, indeed, they had met with some individuals of that Church, but they only longed for more intercourse with the Vaudois, and Lukas was sent with this object into Italy. In Rome he found some pious but timid members of the community, who took him to see the splendid edifices, and told him of the heinous crimes that disgraced the Court of Pope Alexander VI. In Florence, he looked into the face of the expiring Savonarola, and, sick at heart, turned aside to France. There he was cheered with the kindest hospitality by all the congregations, and,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

furnished with letters containing fraternal greetings, he returned home to brave the storms of a new persecution.

The Humanists now raised the cry against the Brethren. However valuable were the services of classical learning in helping the cause of the Reformation in Germany, it appeared rather late on the stage in Bohemia. Accustomed to admiration in other lands, the Humanists here met rivals with whom they could not well cope. Most of the influential men favoured the Unity, which counted members of the best educated families as its own. In short, the Gospel had already gained the ascendant; the revived classical learning thus showed rather pale and dim beside the brighter light, which the Humanists now sought to extinguish. They wrote to Erasmus in a spirit which shows the deepest malignancy against the Gospel; and by letters and other means they so wrought upon the weak King Vladislaus, that he issued, in 1508, a bloody mandate against the Brethren, whose meetings were suppressed, their churches closed, and their books burned, while crowds of them were imprisoned, scourged, and driven from their homes. The woods again became the abode of the persecuted, and rang with their hymns. Lukas, who had been elected senior in 1500, was now the great leader in the cause, and his intrepidity and force of character seemed but to increase with the danger and the claims on his energies. He held colloquies with the Utraquists, wrote letters, apologies, and pamphlets, and travelled constantly to exhort and comfort the scattered flocks; he also sent deputations to Erasmus, and to Kuss at Rostock, pleading for a word in favour of the Unity, but both in vain. He himself was treacherously betrayed, seized, imprisoned, and sentenced, when suddenly the king died, 1516. Though this bigoted monarch had required, in his will, the extirpation of the "pickhards" for the purpose of procuring his own "salvation," the persecution abated, and the Unity emerged from the trial, purified and strengthened. Its organisation withstood the proof. The Brethren were everywhere highly esteemed for their honesty and uprightness, and even the most strenuous opponents of their cause entrusted them with health and wealth. Noblemen invited them to settle on their estates, and defended them at their own peril. Thus, the dauntless Lady Marketa, of Bozkovizze, wrote to the king, in reply to his decree:—"I do not know of any such wicked people as are mentioned in the mandate; but, on the contrary, there are on my estates very honest and pious Christians, whom I, a humble servant of Jesus, cannot permit to be injured." It is remarkable that many who took part in this persecution came to a miserable end, so that it became a proverb, "Whoever is sick of life has but to touch a pickhard."

At the death of Lukas, in 1528, the Unity had three printing-presses, two of which were employed by the great Senior himself. He published about eighty-five works. To the printed Bible (Venice, 1448) was afterwards added a catechism and a large hymn-book. The number of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

congregations must have amounted to nearly five hundred, because four seniors were required to superintend them. Among the protectors of the Brethren, four of the noblest houses of Bohemia and Moravia stand conspicuous.

VINCENT DUSÉK.

DR. CHALMERS THE FOUNDER OF SCOTTISH HOME MISSIONS.

THE genius of Presbyterianism is so familiar with the glory of God and the theocratic equality of all men, that it has never been a great fosterer of hero-worship. Hence some of our readers may think that, in recent centenary utterances, enough has already been said in praise of Chalmers. We haste to tell them that eulogy is no part of the purpose of this article, though we revere Chalmers as a prince of men and the greatest historical Scotsman since the days of John Knox. But our jealousy of hero-worship may easily go so far as to rob us of the best part of our inheritance from the past. It is a true saying that, "they who will not commemorate the great achievements of their ancestors shall achieve nothing worthy of commemoration." The historical method is often the best for recalling us to our neglected duties; and we need constantly to appeal to the great of bygone ages to assist in delivering us from the prevailing littleness of our own.

The name of Chalmers is inseparably interwoven with that revival of the mission spirit which chiefly distinguishes the Christianity of the nineteenth century. One well qualified to judge declared him to have been "the master-mind of his country, if not of his age, and for years the leading missionary spirit in Christendom." If any man may be called the founder of a great Christian work, Chalmers was the founder of Scottish Home Missions. It was he who first set the home mission example to the Scottish Churches; and even to this day, nearly all our mission schemes bear his mark, and the very names he gave them. A sort of universal and many-sided man, he entered into various regions, and became foremost in each of them; yet he chose to be a home missionary first of all, and chiefly. His splendid success in other departments has, however, eclipsed in public fame his missionary activity. We propose, therefore, to disentangle the home-mission element in his biography from its overshadowing environments. The study of his relation to modern evangelism will help us to understand his prodigious efforts in other spheres; for all his great schemes had a home-mission motive, and nearly every one of the twenty-five volumes of his works has a throbbing home-mission heart in it. Such a survey should also lead us by the shortest road to the core of his Christianity, the grandeur of his manhood, and the secret of his vast spiritual influence.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

It is mainly by his mission spirit that Chalmers is still a living force in the Church catholic. For few of the sons of men were ever so gifted with the power of commending their favourite work to their fellows. All over the world there are Christian workers whose convictions and sympathies were first kindled into active zeal at the touch of his example. Two recent instances may be accepted as a fair sample of what might be found in every land where the faith of Christ prevails. The other month, a journalist traced the origin of philanthropic work in Gothenburg to the fact that some Swedes had been stimulated by studying Dr. Chalmers' labours in St. John's parish. Again, one of the foremost Christian citizens in America was lately explaining how he became interested in the welfare of his fellow-men, and stated that it was by perusing the Biography of Dr. Chalmers. Here, then, is one of the grand forces by which God has been pleased to enrich modern Christianity, and it specially concerns Presbyterians.

We propose to rehearse, in their historical order, his home-mission doings; and thereafter we shall inquire how it is that he has wielded such a mighty influence in this sphere.

His Biography has the unique interest which belongs to the representative men of a great epoch. In him, as in the Apostle Paul and Martin Luther, the two master-currents of his age—Moderatism and Evangelicalism—were most amply exhibited. Modern Christian biography probably presents no more striking or instructive contrast than that between the Moderate and the Evangelical minister of Kilmany. It unites, in their perfection, all the conditions which the scientific mind demands for the rigorous application of a reliable test. The result should be studied by those writers who wonder why the more earnest portion of the Scottish peasantry cherish such a rooted aversion to Moderatism. It should also be laid to heart by those who hope that the new Moderatism—with its Hegelian complexion, its more academic dress, and its more outspoken scorn of evangelical dogmas—may find more favour than was granted to its homelier sister. Of course, Chalmers had no hearty evangelism so long as he denounced the Evangelical faith as "dark and mystical," the sure sign of mental imbecility, which, to use his own words, "he nauseated and repudiated as the most drivelling fanaticism." All the world knows that his pastorate, during his Moderate days, was an utter failure, though we may readily believe that his youthful enthusiasm developed all the moral and spiritual possibilities of Moderatism. Those who wish to know the sort of heart-work to which his evangelical preaching introduced Chalmers, should read a little book of which this generation knows little more than the name—"The Missionary of Kilmany." It is a quiet, charming, prose idyl of rural home-missions. Ploughboys, on their way home from the kirk, went over the dyke to pray under the fir-trees. The average bothy was probably not more a nursery of virtue then than it is now, but Divine grace changed one and another of its inmates not only into sincere Christians, but also, as

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

their minister used often to boast, into "companionable men," and "gentlemen." The eager aspirant after academic society is now found gladly fraternising with converted ploughmen, who taught him that deep respect for the common people in which he was probably not surpassed by any man whose name figures on the pages of biography.

The desponding, who fear that the work of Christ is not making progress, should read the account of Dr. Chalmers' translation to the Tron Kirk of Glasgow in 1815. A great revolution must have passed over the city since then. At this time of day it seems incredible that his appointment could have awakened such a storm of opposition. The fame which came to him as the greatest preacher in the land did not subdue his ruling passion. His mind was soon fixed on the "*closes*" around his church: he must visit them, and become personally acquainted with their inhabitants. If we make an effort to realise his position and the state of opinion around him, we shall do justice to his originality and heroism, and also to the fervour which raised him above the tyrannous traditions of his office. In practical matters, it often happens that what is most original soonest becomes most commonplace; and we would rank high among the original conceptions of his mind the resolution to saturate the whole of his city parish with Christian influences. He was not dismayed by the size of his parish, which contained 11,000 or 12,000 souls; he visited them all from house to house. He spent many hours every week among the most degraded in the Saltmarket and the Wynds, at a time when his counsel was sought by statesmen, and his society was courted by the wealthy and the noble. As he brooded over the facts he witnessed, the fire burned within him, and his brain teemed with home-mission inventions. He established day schools and Sabbath schools, and all the appliances that belong to territorial work; and that at a time when hardly one man in a hundred favoured them, while the vast majority united in a haughty opposition. His energy of mind and body at this time makes us think of him very much as the ancients regarded their fabled race of giants. We feel sadly that our generation is of a smaller mould. From these barren mission-fields he gathered an abundant harvest. He gained his facts at first hand, and described them with all the vividness of an eager eye-witness. His views on social questions were thus stamped with reality and originality, and he could urge them with an authority and power that are not granted to the mere thinker.

In 1819 he removed, with a portion of his flock, to St. John's, which had been built by the magistrates as a church-extension effort. As the Tron Church had been the birthplace, so St. John's Church became the nursery of his home-mission ideas and schemes. He exulted in the opportunity he now had of testing all his plans. His glowing imagination never disdained the aid of accurate statistics, and he soon discovered that his new parish contained 2161 families, of whom 845 had no seats in any place of worship. He resolved that his congre-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

gation should be thoroughly territorial in a twofold sense. So far as possible, the inhabitants of the district should have, by preference, the available seats in the church; and then each individual in the parish should be sought out, and plied with all sorts of Christian ministrations. His amazing faculty of inspiring into others his own convictions and zeal, secured for him the co-operation of a large band of influential merchants, several of whom inaugurated that princely liberality for which Glasgow is renowned.

Territorialism shaped all his efforts. He had no patience with that vague and vagrant philanthropy resembling Solomon's fool with eyes in the ends of the earth. He aimed at reviving and ennobling both the old Evangelicalism and the old parochial system. And certainly his was no meagre evangelism which counted everything not spiritual foreign to it. He grappled with the social condition of his parish in its entire length and breadth. All sorts of schools were established, and patrons were found to pay for the education of, and find employment for, the poor children. The poor laws seemed to him a "moral nuisance," sure to blight all whom they touched. He maintained indignantly, that all the poor should be relieved by voluntary charity; and with him, in such matters, no impossibility lay between the "should" and the "shall." Amid the amazement and ridicule of his generation, he arranged to relieve all the poor in his parish apart from the legal poor-rates. And he succeeded: at least, he proved that, had there been a Chalmers in every parish, all Scotland's poor might then have been relieved by the unaided hand of Christian charity.

His St. John's pastorate was rich and happy, and quickened his mind into its most creative mood. He wrote books on "the Christian and civic economy of large towns," and the general condition of the people in all its aspects. The reader of these works is greeted in almost every page by a refreshing heartiness. They are enriched with the results of his experience crystallised into felicitous phrases, which are now commonplaces throughout Christendom. Discouraged toilers among the poor might read them with great advantage. They lift our eyes to the hills; their energy and hope are contagious; they burst at every pore with the personal mesmerism which the writer wielded over so many of his contemporaries.

His startling facts and impetuous appeals were now beginning to arouse the public mind. He demanded twenty more churches for the poor of Glasgow; and though his demand called forth the amazement of most, and the ridicule of the rest, he lived to see twenty new churches built before the Disruption, and at least twenty more after it.

His residence at St. Andrews as Professor of Moral Philosophy—1823-1828—is no blank in his home-mission history; but the atmosphere of the University was not congenial, and among his colleagues he stood almost entirely alone. Two facts belonging to this period reveal his rare devotion to his chosen work, as well as his Christian nobility. No

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

sooner was he quietly settled in St. Andrews than he selected a district in the town, regularly visited all the families in it, and invited all the children to a Sabbath school in his own house, teaching them himself, and preparing for the class with care. The other fact is this: at the close of his first session in St. Andrews—urged by his home-mission hunger—he came to Glasgow, and spent six weeks, very much by way of holiday, visiting incessantly in his old district, and preaching in the mission church. He never did harder work than during these six weeks of labours of love. His biographer says that one has a feeling of fatigue in simply reading the account in his journal of what he did then. He repeated this six weeks' visit for at least another year, if not more. No wonder that some of the best of his students caught the blessed contagion of their master's zeal, and went forth as ardent evangelists. Five of them became foreign missionaries. These were the Rev. Mr. Adam, who died prematurely on the banks of the Ganges, Mr. Nesbit, of Bombay, Drs. Mackay and Ewart, of Calcutta, and our own modern Apostle of the Gentiles, Alexander Duff.

It is now time to notice his greatest home-mission undertaking. The population of Scotland in the seventeenth century was less than one million, and was supplied with the means of grace by between 900 and 1000 parish churches. By 1833 it had increased to upwards of two millions; but during the intervening century and a-half, only sixty-two churches had been erected by voluntary contribution within the Establishment. That is to say, the missionary life of the National Church, with the resources of well nigh the whole Scottish nation at its command, is indicated by the erection of sixty-two churches in the whole of Scotland within a century and a-half, during which the population of Scotland had more than doubled itself. In 1834 Dr. Chalmers was appointed Convener of the General Assembly's Committee for erecting churches in the destitute parts of the land. The scheme, we have read somewhere, originated with himself as he looked down daily upon the Water of Leith village when crossing the Dean Bridge on his way home from the University in Edinburgh, where he had been appointed Professor of Theology. It was a wild little place, and without a church; and his mind pictured all the blessings which a zealous and well-directed territorialism might bring to it, and to all such places from Maidenkirk to John O'Groat's. By this time, his numerous writings, eagerly read by thousands, had roused the slumbering Church to a sense of her long-neglected duties. His thrilling appeals were seconded by the fears which then possessed the minds of all thoughtful patriots by reason of the frequent outbursts of mutinous discontent among the humbler classes. The love of country conspired with the constraining love of Christ to speed on the new movement. The Evangelical party in the Church naturally rallied round him. His whole soul was in the work, and his success was a wonder to every body except himself; for his generous hopefulness predicted the result

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

it did so much to secure. The liberality of his proposals called forth an equal liberality among his supporters, whose minds he had familiarised with larger ideas than any other leader of the Church had then uttered. Within a single year he saw as many churches built as voluntary effort had added to the Establishment during the previous century and a-half. In seven years, 222 churches were built in necessitous districts, at a cost of over £300,000, all provided by voluntary contributions; thus the congregations of the Establishment were increased by more than one-fifth of their whole number. These churches, which soon became famous in the controversies of the day, were called "*quoad sacra*," as their parishes were only for sacred purposes; while the parishes around the older churches were also for civil or State purposes, or "*quoad civilia*." But the Ten Years' Conflict at length laid an arresting hand upon his enterprise; and he was led by a way he would fain have shunned to a larger scheme of church extension than he had yet dreamt of.

When the Disruption came, the law of the land had to decide who should be the owners of the 222 *quoad sacra* churches which he and his comrades had erected. The decision entailed upon him hardships that might easily have damped the ardour of a less noble nature. All the *quoad sacra* churches were taken from his party; and for the debts still remaining on these buildings his coadjutors were in some cases held personally responsible, while at the same time they had to build new churches for themselves.

But none of these things moved him by a hair's-breadth from his chosen path. The needle was true to its pole amid all the wild winds and waves of Disruption times. The cherished ideal of his life as a churchman was a Church having a king for its nursing father, and carrying the Gospel to every corner of the land, especially among the poorest. He then believed that only an Established Church was equal to such a task. Yet when the mere existence of the Free Church financially seemed scarcely possible, he never thought for a moment of confining himself, in the first instance, to the classes most likely to practise liberality. His Journals and his "Sabbath Scripture Readings" prove abundantly that even when the little bark of his Church seemed on the point of shipwreck, the home missionary was never overshadowed by the church leader. The courage of his missionary proposals rose with the perils that seemed to mock them. This is how he addressed the first General Assembly of the Free Church:—"We shall not stop short, I trust, in our great and glorious enterprise, till, in the language you have heard, 'the light of the Gospel be carried to every cottage door within the limits of the Scottish territory.' This will open a boundless field for the liberality of our Christian brethren—a bright and beautiful ulterior, to which every eye should be directed, that each may have in full view the great and glorious achievement of a Church commensurate with the land in which we dwell, and every heart be

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

elevated by the magnificent aim to cover with the requisite number of churches, and with God's blessing on the means, Christianly to educate, and in return for our performances and prayers, to Christianise the whole of Scotland."

We must not stay to specify his services in inoculating—to use one of the many phrases he coined—the students with his own spirit ; for we need all our time and space to give a hint of his personal exertions. We hasten, therefore, to record his last, and, to our thinking, greatest home-mission work. In 1844, when in his sixty-fourth year, he rid himself, as far as possible, of all kinds of public work, though the infant organisations of the Free Church sorely needed all his energies ; and then, being let go, he went to his own company, to his home-mission work, which had been all along the home of his heart. His love for the poor of the people burst forth into its most beautiful manifestation as he ripened for glory. "I have determined," he wrote to a friend in 1844, "to assume a poor district of 2000 people, and superintend it myself, though it be a work greatly too much for my declining strength and means. Yet such do I hold to be the efficiency of the method with the Divine blessing, that, perhaps, as the concluding act of my public life, I shall make the effort to exemplify what as yet I have only expounded." His desire was to work off one home-mission model, or a normal specimen of the process by which a single locality might be reclaimed from the vast and desolate wilderness.

What reader of his Biography has not been detained in admiration before this sublime spectacle ! The foremost orator of the day, who could command the most influential audiences whenever he chose to preach, preferred to decrease into the home missionary. He was not in the least discouraged by the difficulties, or disgusted with the humiliating surroundings, of his self-imposed task. So far as appears, he made far greater efforts to win the friendship of the West Port outcasts than he ever made to gain favour among any other class of society. In his new mission-district he was only known as the "puir minister." One woman in the district, when asked if she went to the new mission church at her door, considerably replied : "Oh ay, there's a body Chalmers preaches there, and I whiles gang to keep him in countenance, honest man."

In this, his last home-mission work, he showed his great practical sagacity. He knew that his ideas were considered Utopian, romantic, and the offspring of a vigorous imagination. Though he had entire faith in them, he knew well that, while they were mere ideas, they would be like disembodied spirits, which could neither grasp nor be grasped by men. He must therefore present them as facts, and gain for them a place among the practical principles of the Church. Then he knew that the energies of the Church were paralysed by the lack of hopefulness regarding the salvability of the outcast ; and he could not help believing that an honest effort would justify his expectations.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

He had also great faith in the *inexhausted teinds* of the Church—the powers of service that lie sleeping in the membership; and he rightly judged that a successful mission would do much to utilise and multiply them. Accordingly, he turned his back upon the most inviting paths that ever opened out before a churchman, and wended his way to the obscurest haunts of vice.

The most repulsive district was, to his mind, the most attractive. He selected the West Port. Its population was about 2000, not more than one-eighth of which ever darkened a church door. One-fourth of the whole were paupers; and another fourth were street beggars, thieves, and prostitutes: such was the district which he delighted to call his garden.

He gathered around him a band of visitors, and gave each a corner with about twenty families. All the visitors met in the West Port for prayer and conference every Saturday evening, and their chief rejoiced to be among them. For a few weeks he was laid aside by illness; and he pled with his doctors that they would just let him go to the West Port meetings, promising that if they did so, he would give up all others. Though he could not meet with them in a gloomy corner in the West Port, he sent letters to them, in one of which he says, "The first use I will make of my freedom will be to revisit the West Port, and take all the share I can in the management of its affairs, deeming this to be of far greater importance than that I should continue my connection with any of the public committees of the Church. These I mean to give up; but our present attempt to reclaim the population of the West Port is what I never can abandon till forced to it by absolute necessity."

He soon opened a tan-loft for public worship, and set in motion all his favourite agencies. His biographer tells us that "there may have been other works of his hands upon which a larger amount of labour was bestowed, but there was none over which so many prayers were offered." Very touching are these prayers: here is one of them:—"It is yet but the day of small things with us; and I, in all likelihood, shall be taken off ere that much greater progress is made. But give me the foretaste and the confident foresight of this great Christian and moral triumph ere I die. Let me, at least, if it be Thy blessed will, see—though it should be only in one or in a small number of specimens—a people living in some district of aliens, as the West Port, reclaimed at least into willing and obedient hearers, afterwards, in Thine own good time, to become doers of Thy Word. Give me, O Lord, a token for the larger accomplishment of this ere I die."

In 1847 he opened the West Port Church (which has ever since been the scene of remarkable prosperity), and soon after presided at the first sacrament of the Lord's Supper administered within its walls. Of the 132 communicants present, about 100 were from the West Port. That communion gave him the deepest gratification. Regarding it, he thus

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

wrote to a friend :—"I wish to communicate what to me is the most joyful event of my life. I have been intent for thirty years on the completion of a territorial experiment, and I have now to bless God for the consummation of it." The next day, he said to Mr. Tasker, "I have got now the desire of my heart"—referring to the fairly established church and its agencies—"God has indeed heard my prayer, and I could now lay down my head in peace and die."

Thrice happy workman ! Your life-work is not a shapeless fragment destined to die with you. Your grand idea has been translated into an abiding model, which shall encourage many to go and do likewise.

The work he had sketched out was done, and he had nothing to do but die. Five weeks after his communion-service among the reclaimed prodigals of the West Port, on the Sabbath evening, he laid down his head in peace, and fell asleep in Christ. And they buried his body "amid the tears of a nation, and with more than kingly honours."

In another article we may examine the sources of his mission power. Our parting word shall be to Christian workers among the poor, for whom specially this article has been written. We invite their attention to this pure and colossal home-mission figure: it is well worth their while to place it before their minds in the fullest light, and to study it carefully. It is recorded that Corregio, one of the world's gifted painters, when he stood before the master-piece of the great genius of his age, which he could never hope to equal, was inspired and not depressed by the sight ; and added, with dignified humility, "I, too, am a painter." While striving to realise the heavenly companionships which encompass all who are labourers together with God, the humblest assailant of home heathenism will feel helped by claiming kindred with the greatest of his fellows ; and might fittingly close this brief chronicle of the doings of the prince of home missionaries by saying unto himself, "I, too, am a home missionary."

JAMES WELLS.

NOTES OF THE DAY.

THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING IN PHILADELPHIA.

BEFORE these lines can meet our readers' eyes, the great meeting to which we have looked forward during the past three years will have been held. The preparations of the brethren in Philadelphia and in New York, of the various committees that had to make reports, of those who had agreed to submit papers, of the delegates—some of whom had travelled over half the globe—of the hosts that, with American hospitality, opened their houses for their visitors, will have all in part served their purpose, and the interest of expectation be replaced by that of memory and the making of estimates as to the probable results of the meeting. Though writing beforehand, we may safely anticipate several points.

We do not expect, then, as large an attendance as we had in Edinburgh, the falling off being occasioned in great measure by the scanty attendance of brethren from the Continent of Europe, but especially of the delegates from Great Britain. Some we had hoped to see will be missing. Intending to be with us, their plans have been overruled, and they have gone up higher; Dr. Beadle, the chairman of the business committee, has entered into his rest, while his successor in office—Dr. Boardman—has in like manner passed from us. The Earl of Kintore will also be absent. And lastly, Dr. Adams, who, with such tender solemnity, closed the Edinburgh Council, and had agreed to open that of Philadelphia with a sermon, has been called away to the General Assembly above. His place will be taken by Dr. Paxton of New York, while Dr. Breed of Philadelphia will render the service expected from Dr. Beadle. Only a few of those that had been members of the Council of 1877 will be found among the delegates in 1880, the Churches having apparently sought, and with great wisdom, to make the honours go round, by sending, with a very few exceptions, new men. A similar principle was followed by the programme committee, the result being, doubtless, in every way beneficial.

We confess to looking forward to this Council with some anxiety. No society or movement can continue to exist unless it is of direct use to its promoters. The idea of a great Confederation or Alliance of the Presbyterian Reformed Churches of the world is a very grand one, but men most properly ask, What is the Alliance going to *do*? To what new or hitherto neglected work is it going to summon the Churches? What solutions of the practical difficulties connected with all Church work does it present? What help is it going to give us as brethren or as Churches? Now, these and such-like questions must be faced. It is a very pleasant thing for brethren to meet together, and in the enjoyment of Christian fellowship, to have a good time. It is a very good thing to show the world that Presbyterian Churches far apart are yet "members one of another," and constitute a world-wide denomination; but the Alliance is only the outcome of these already existent facts, and the important question is, Of what service can the Alliance be to the Churches that compose it? and unless this question be answered satisfactorily, the Alliance must go to pieces. Now, we believe it can be thus answered, and that every Council for which proper arrangements are made, will do so with ever increasing distinctness.

Waiting in ignorance of what the Philadelphia Council may do, we hope that whatever may be brought before it by papers, attention may be given specially to a few topics of present or of approaching practical importance. What we, as Presbyterians, believe, is a matter that the outside world sometimes professes to have difficulty in learning. Sooner or later, the Council might give utterance to the creed of the Church in some brief and unauthoritative statement of the matters on which we are all agreed. Connected with mission-work, there is an immense

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

number of complex questions, in dealing with which the brethren on the fields, and the Churches themselves, are only feeling their way. A Council meeting gives a valuable opportunity for a wide comparing of notes; and the results, embodied in some carefully expressed paragraphs, might from time to time be laid before the Churches. The worship of the Church should not be allowed to drift away, as in some cases it may be doing, out of all the old channels. The Churches would doubtless like to hear something in reference to the new version of the Scriptures. Shall we say it, or let the newspapers do so? The hymnology of a Church is a great bond of union among its members. Shall we try to have in our Churches, and in use among them, a book of common praise? And if so, what shall it be? Some of our brethren have always used Liturgies, and are about the most stiff-backed Calvinists and Presbyterians we have; may we not hear them on this matter? A talk round the council fire can do no harm.

Such are but a few of the questions that to-day are in men's minds; and the deliverances, on such matters, of a Council, not claiming to be infallible, but recognised as influential, as disinterested, as candid, and competent, would be received with respect, and go far to form and to lead public opinion. If these deliverances be judicious, men would soon come to realise the usefulness to them of the Alliance, and be found admitting that while not a General Assembly in the proper sense of that title, it approached it as nearly as is possible under existing circumstances, and is not unworthy of taking the place of "the missing link" in our grand Presbyterian system.

G. D. M.

MEMBERS OF GENERAL COUNCIL.

The following lists of delegates were unfortunately not forwarded in time for publication in our previous number:—

From the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

Ministers.—Rev. Principal M'KNIGHT, D.D., Halifax; Rev. Principal M'VICAR, LL.D., Montreal; Rev. Principal GRANT, D.D., Kingston; Rev. Principal CAVEN, D.D., Toronto; Rev. WILLIAM REID, D.D., Toronto; Rev. JOHN JENKINS, D.D., Montreal; Rev. D. J. MACDONNELL, B.D., Toronto; Rev. R. F. BURNS, D.D., Halifax; Rev. DONALD MACRAE, M.A., St. John's, N.B.; Rev. G. D. MATHEWS, D.D., Quebec. *Elders.*—Mr. T. W. TAYLOR, M.A., Toronto; Hon. ALEXANDER MORRIS, Toronto; Mr. JAMES CROIL, Montreal; Hon. J. M'MURRICH, Toronto; J. D. M'Donald, M.D., Hamilton; Mr. T. M'CRAE, Guelph; Mr. J. B. FAIRBAIRN, Bowmanville; Mr. J. K. BLAIR, Truro, N.S.

From the Presbyterian Church of England.

Ministers.—Rev. WILLIAM GRAHAM, D.D., Professor of Church History and Pastoral Theology; Rev. ALEX. MACLEOD, D.D., Minister at Birkenhead; Rev. H. L. MACKENZIE, Missionary to China. *Elders.*—G. B. BRUCE, Esq., Convener of Home Mission; GEORGE DUNCAN, Esq., Convener of the Treasurership Committee; THOMAS MATHESON, Esq., Joint-Convener of the Union Thanksgiving Fund.

THE LATE DR. ADAMS.

The death of the Rev. Dr. Adams, President of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, proves a heavy loss to the whole Presbyterian world. It does not, certainly, come on us by surprise; for he had been for some time previously in such a state of health as to prepare the minds of his friends for the change. But it is only his actual removal that has made us realise how much we possessed in him.

William Adams was born in Colchester, Connecticut, in January, 1807. After receiving his early education from his father, John Adams, so well known as a teacher and philanthropist, he studied at Yale College, which he left in 1820 to pursue his studies at Andover Theological Seminary, with a view to the work of the ministry. In 1834 he went to New York, where he was settled

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

as pastor of the old Broome Street Central Presbyterian Church, with which he was identified for thirty-nine years. His kindly disposition, ripe scholarship, and polished manners, almost at once secured for him a very high position. Under his ministry the small congregation increased so vastly that it became necessary, first to enlarge the old building, and subsequently, in 1854, to erect a new edifice, the Madison Square Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Adams was moderator of the New School General Assembly in 1852; he took a leading part in promoting the union of the Old and New School Churches in 1870-71. Many ineffectual attempts were made to make him remove from his pastoral sphere in New York. Several times he was urgently pressed to go to London, and in 1871 he was elected Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, but declined to accept the office. At last, in 1873, when his son-in-law, Mr. John Crosby Brown offered to endow the Seminary with \$300,000 if Dr. Adam would accept the office of President, he resigned his pastorate, and became the head of the institution, where his large experience in the ministry was of the utmost value for the training of the students.

Dr. Adams attained considerable eminence as an author. He published "The Two Gardens—Eden, Gethsemane," "Conversations of Jesus Christ with Representative Men," &c. &c. And he was among the first to call attention to the Catacombs of Rome, and to indicate the importance of the inscriptions as throwing light on the facts of history.

Those who were present at the First Presbyterian Council at Edinburgh will ever remember the deeply solemn and touching address with which Dr. Adams brought the proceedings to a close. He had agreed to preach the sermon at the opening of the Second Council, but the Master has ruled otherwise, and called him away to his rest.

THE LATE MR. JAMES WATSON.

On Wednesday, 1st September, at his own house in London, died Mr. James Watson, the head of the firm of James Nisbet & Co., the publishers of *The Catholic Presbyterian*. The firm was established above sixty years ago by the late James Nisbet, Esq., a native of Kelso, who went to London when quite a lad, commenced business for himself, rose into prosperity and honour, lived a singularly active and useful life, and died, much mourned, some twenty-five years ago. His first partner was Mr. Murray, who died some years since, well known to the frequenters of Berners Street for his quiet Christian demeanour, and his obliging, amiable disposition. His second partner was Mr. Thomas Taylor, who died but a few years ago, a man of high literary taste and accomplishments, as well as of earnest and simple piety. Mr. Watson came next, and has for many years sustained the reputation and extended greatly the business of the house by his unwearied and large-minded energy. It reflects great credit on Mr. Nisbet's sagacity to have chosen as his partners and successors two such men as Mr. Taylor and Mr. Watson. Their decided Christian character, their cultivation and refinement, in combination with their business habits, fitted them for being at the head of such a firm.

Mr. Watson was born and educated in Glasgow. He came to Kelso in 1838; and during the few years of his sojourn there, developed not only his business habits, but his Christian worth and zeal. He became an elder in Dr. Bonar's church, and the superintendent of his Sabbath schools. In both of these positions he made his mark very decidedly, and did his work with no common zeal; and when he left for London, he took with him the affection and honour not only of his pastor and fellow office-bearers, but of the whole congregation.

It was during his stay in Kelso that Mr. Nisbet made his acquaintance. The opinion he then formed of Mr. Watson's character and qualifications led to the closer connection, and finally to the proposal that he should become a partner in the Berners Street firm, where his position in the establishment gave full scope to his energies,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

and amply justified Mr. Nisbet's confidence. Under him and Mr. Taylor the business expanded on all sides; and yet as if that were not enough for his untiring activity, he entered the school board, and did a large amount of work there, besides taking a prominent part in the management of Mudie's well-known library.

Yet these outward spheres of Christian energy did not hinder his throwing himself with all earnestness into the interior and more spiritual work of the congregation, of the Sabbath school, of the Bible class, and the visitation of the sick and poor. Into all the departments of true work for Christ he went with his whole soul; not sparing himself in health, or time, or money, or exertion. He was large-hearted in devising plans of usefulness, and he was generous in his givings to all. His hospitality was unbounded, as many a minister knows; his considerateness and obligingness, both in business and out of business, were all the more noticeable, because his hands were always full of work; his cheerfulness and politeness made his society at all times pleasant; and his house will long be remembered for its Christian sociality and kindness. It was a centre for many,—the meeting-place of Christian men of every Church and nation. Berners Street and Endsleigh Street will often be revisited in other days as spots of no common interest.

He who writes this brief and imperfect notice has often had to bear the pain of friendships broken by death: seldom has he had to mourn over such a breach as this. Of this honoured and beloved friend of forty-two years he may say—

"Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit;
Nulli flebilior quam tibi Virgili."

H. B.

TRANSATLANTIC NOTES.

II.

When at Boston, the illness of a member of our party prevented us from accepting an invitation to visit Wellesley College, a new institution for the education of young women, of which every one speaks in the highest terms. The college not being in session, a visit could, of course, have conveyed no adequate impression of the method pursued in the United States for the higher education of young women; but I was assured that the place was a sight in itself, and that even its external arrangements would have impressed me with the earnestness with which intelligent Americans are grappling with this great question. The building, large and imposing, situated in splendid grounds, has been contributed, under circumstances of touching interest, by Mr. Durant, a Christian gentleman of large means, and the whole arrangements of the institution are made on the most ample scale. There is at present a preparatory school, or academic department, designed to prepare young women for the collegiate course, this last being the great feature of the institution. The preparatory school, however, is only a temporary arrangement.

Wellesley College is a real college. It is designed to furnish for young women an education as complete and as high as any college or university furnishes for young men. It is arranged according to the plan of American colleges, with a freshman's year, a sophomore year, a junior year, and a senior year. There is a general college course, adapted for the circumstances of most, but there are also three special elective courses for honours in classics, in mathematics, and in modern languages, one or other of which students may choose. Besides the course for ordinary students, there is a special one adapted for those who propose to become teachers. From personal intercourse with friends and students of this college, I have no doubt of its great efficiency and success. It has some three hundred students, and they speak of it with great enthusiasm. It is under thoroughly Christian influences, and pervaded by an earnest Christian spirit. I cannot but admire the way in which Christian Americans of large means carry out such projects as this. They see that such an institution is needed, and that if Christians do not bestir

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

themselves, others will. And when they take it up, they devise liberal things. Mr. Durant resolves that everything shall be done handsomely and thoroughly. In the old world, rich Christian laymen are slow of taking up a new idea, and often allow new projects in literature, education, and such matters to be organised by men who have no sympathy with religion. Americans are more acute in seeing what is needed to meet the rising wants of the age, and more generous in providing the sinews of war.

From Boston I pass on to a place hitherto unknown to fame—a village in the east of Massachusetts, named Northfield. I call it a village, speaking in the English manner, but in America it is a town, though very unlike the ordinary American city. It is seven miles in length, and has only about 1500 inhabitants. That is to say, there are farm-houses dotted over the road for seven miles; and as they lie somewhat thicker at a spot where there is also a post-office, a store or two, a couple of churches, and a railway station, that may be regarded as the heart of the town. The general appearance of the place is extremely pleasant. The "street," or road, is about fifty yards wide, shadowed by double or quadruple rows of ancient elms, and grass-grown, save where a very sandy track, which is never disturbed by the barbarous thing we call road-metal, affords a course for the light-wheeled buggies and waggons of the farmers. Neat wooden houses, their white walls and green window-screens bright in the brilliant sunshine, nestle in the woods; the broad Connecticut river flows with a leisurely calm through its beautiful valley; and undulating mountain-chains, clothed to their summits with pine and hardwood, close in one of the most pleasing landscapes you can find in America.

About a mile from what we have called the heart of the town is a plain but bright-looking "frame" house, with its screen of elm trees in front, for which we have been unable to hear of any other name than "Moody's." It is the summer home of the great evangelist. A few yards back from the road is the home of his venerable mother—Mr. Moody's own birth-place. Desirous of having something like a home for himself and his family, where he might spend his vacations in the hot season, he acquired a few years ago this plain house with a field or two around. But he had hardly got possession when the instinct of Christian usefulness led him to make an addition—one large room for Bible readings, and a number of small bed-rooms, in order that, while he was not there, the house might be used as a boarding-school for the education of young women. And now his ideas have taken a wider sweep. On the hill behind he has built quite a handsome college, with accommodation for sixty or seventy girls—a little "Wellesley" in its way, but not so ambitious. It is to be a boarding-school for the education of girls of good abilities and character; and it is designed, by means of education, and especially Christian education, to fit them for greater Christian usefulness, and for filling higher positions as teachers or missionaries. One feature of it deserves particular notice: the daughters of American Indians are to have a special place in it. Mr. Moody feels that the Indians have been ill-treated, and he is desirous of doing them a kindness. It may surprise some of our readers to know that some of the American tribes of Indians are now civilised and Christianised, with schools and churches of their own. We saw some of the letters of application from Indian girls, expressing the purpose for which they desired the benefits of Mr. Moody's college. These notes were such as any other American girls might have written. One cannot but desire a double blessing on this feature of the college, and feel how delightful it would be if the Indian girls trained in it should return to their own people carrying with them the richest blessings of heaven.

It would not be fair, when one receives the hospitality of a friend, to divulge before the public what goes on in the sanctity of his home. We observed that some who preceded us were not very particular about this, and that abundant details appeared in some of the religious journals of America respecting Mr. Moody and his life at Northfield. Suffice it to say, that we found Mr. Moody the same honest, hearty, unsophisticated man whom we had known and loved six or

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

seven years ago, under our roof in Edinburgh; full of frolic and humour in his family; deeply interested in his pigs, horses, and bees,—for whatever he does he does with his heart; devotedly attached to his son "Paul," a young apostle of sixteen months, often to be seen about the court-yard in his father's arms; but we found him with his heart as deeply moved as ever with longings for the souls of men, and trying to use the wonderful influence which God has given him so as to excite the least amount of prejudice, and make him as far as possible "all things to all men." What were holidays to Mr. Moody would not have been holidays to every one. On a Sunday morning he would be up with the lark, drive in his buggy twenty or five-and-twenty miles, preach twice or thrice to great audiences in the open air, and return home in the cool of the evening. On other days he would be busy with correspondence, with arrangements for the opening of his college, and for a great convention or religious conference which was to take place just before the opening. One helper worked with him in connection with the admissions to the college, another was engaged in preparing his sermons for the press, and a third took charge of the building and furnishing of the institution. He seemed great in his old faculty of giving to every man his work.

We could say much of the moral courage involved in his settling at his birth-place, among relations and old acquaintances, of whom many are Unitarians, and regard his views and procedure with strong aversion. We could give instances of the remarkable change which he has been the instrument of effecting in cases not a few. But we will not enter here on such delicate ground. We content ourselves with one or two instances of his usefulness which already belong to the public. Among his Bibles, we saw one which bore to have been presented to him by the "Prisoners of Baltimore." The explanation was, that last winter, while labouring in that city, and holding many services each Sunday, Mr. Moody preached to the prisoners every Sunday morning, and with great effect. The change on them was most remarkable, and the authorities observed that much fewer of the discharged prisoners returned to them, on other commitments, than had been customary before. The Bible was a token of their gratitude to Mr. Moody.

While we were at Northfield, there appeared a remarkable letter in the *New York Herald*, signed "Thurlow Weed." All Americans are familiar with the name of the octogenarian, who, some years ago, was among the greatest of American politicians, and the most influential pullers of political wires. His letter, or as the editor called it, "sermon," in the *Herald*, was not in his ancient strain. It was occasioned by the public career of Colonel Ingersoll, the Bradlaugh of the United States. Colonel Ingersoll goes about the country, ridiculing the Bible, and making men infidels. He is said to be of a very genial nature, remarkably clever and witty, an excellent speaker, and his lectures are received with immense approval by very crowded audiences. Mr. Weed's letter contained a comparison of Mr. Moody's work with Mr. Ingersoll's. Mr. Moody led men to think of the highest of all subjects, and while promoting their salvation, stimulated self-control, temperance, beneficence, and every other virtue. The line of his progress was marked by the reform of drunkards, the union of families, the consecration of young men's energies to nobler objects, the drying up of the sources of the world's misery, and the opening of fountains of benediction and prosperity. What could Ingersoll point to, to match such work? What drunkard had he reformed, what home had he made happy, what life had he rescued from selfishness, and made noble and great? The drift of Mr. Weed's letter was, that, tried by its fruits, Christianity was infinitely better than any thing that Ingersoll could substitute for it. Perhaps the letter was not so remarkable for its power as for its being an honest and hearty testimony to Christ. How came Mr. Weed to bear this testimony, emerging from the retirement to which he had betaken himself, to appear once more in an American journal? When Mr. Moody was in New York, Mr. Weed was a frequent attender at his meetings, and got spiritual blessing in connection with them. Of all the singular things in Mr. Moody's career, one of the most striking

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

is, his influence with men unlike himself. What could he be said to have had in common with the veteran American politician? Yet even such men he has been the instrument of leading to Christ.

The life of the New England farmer is somewhat rough and laborious. The farms are not usually very large—perhaps fifty acres of arable land; and the proprietor has to work hard with his own hands. Nor are matters mending. The far richer produce of the western states is bringing down the value of land in New England, as in Old England likewise, and considerable parts of the soil are going out of cultivation. But farmers and people generally have much more intelligence and culture than would be inferred in Britain from the horny condition of their hands. A gentleman who had come recently from a distance, told me, that having had occasion to get a horse-shoe “fixed” (literally) at a smithy, the blacksmith’s man, on examining the horse’s ankle, observed that growth of bone called “shingles” which is so well known to horse dealers, and remarked that Professor Huxley regarded it as the rudiment of a toe. We doubt whether such a remark would have been made, in the like circumstances, in any other part of the globe.

We could not hear much to encourage us in regard to the progress of religion in New England. No doubt, we learned that Mr. Emerson and some of his followers seem to be becoming less pantheistic, and are more disposed to belief in a personal God. But with respect to the professedly Christian Church, there seems little evidence on the part of Unitarians of a return to orthodoxy. We were told of a movement more in the opposite direction among the Congregationalists—of preachers of more orthodox connection, who, in reference to the doctrines of grace,—conversion, justification, and the like,—are ridiculing what they call the “religion of magic.” This really strikes at the root of supernatural religion, and of direct Divine operations in the heart of man. Any change for the better must be a natural development—a drawing out, training and strengthening the good that is naturally in men, carried on, not in dependence on supernatural power, but in accordance with the laws of the human mind. If we are not mistaken, it is in this direction that one of the greatest perils to the Christian faith now lies. It is not unlikely that one of the chief battles for the faith in coming days will be round this very question, Is there a direct Divine interposition in the turning of men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God?

The question of Sabbath-recreation was undergoing considerable discussion in the newspapers and in the pulpit. The newspapers were arguing that it was right for men and women who were pent up during the week in towns, to repair to the seaside on the summer Sabbath, and spend the day in pleasant idleness and recreation. The more orthodox pulpits were lifting up their voices against this, as a desecration of the Sabbath, contrary to the law of God, and injurious to those who might be led to do it. Here and there a “liberal” Unitarian preacher would join with the newspapers and advocate the Continental Sunday, reserving a little bit of the day for early public worship. It is but too apparent that the popular current runs very strongly in the direction encouraged by the secular press. In many churches,—chiefly, but not wholly, Unitarian,—there is in summer only a morning meeting for worship, or at least for preaching, it being found difficult to assemble the people a second time. It seems to be admitted that, in Sabbath-keeping, America has lost ground during the last ten years. Mr. Moody spoke to us of the Sabbath as a lost institution, in so far as the mass of the people are concerned; and regarded this, along with the prevalence of Rationalism and Popery, and the practice of universal suffrage, as among the perils of the country, the result of which no man could foretell.

It has always been our conviction that negative theology, especially as represented by Unitarianism, must be feeble in its aggressive character, very unwilling to make war on heathenism, and disposed to think that there is not much real difference, in spirit, between one religion and another. To test this impression, we asked a friend whether Unitarians had anything in the shape of missions to the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

heathen? "I never knew but one," he said, "and they withdrew it after ten years, because their missionary during that time had made but one convert, and that was himself—he had become a convert to Buddhism!"

A visit of a few days to the White Mountains in New Hampshire furnishes little or no material for notes in this journal. The White Mountains are the Switzerland of New England, and though very far from equalling the glorious scenery of the Alps, furnish many picturesque and beautiful scenes, chiefly of wood and mountain. There is a railway to the top of Mount Washington—the Righi of America—and for two months of the year, a daily newspaper—*Among the Clouds*—is published on the summit. We had the honour of being the subject of a short editorial,—rather a lame one, it must be confessed, as the editor knew absolutely nothing of us but our name and residence. Our party were the only subjects of Queen Victoria on the summit that night, and to that we owed our distinction. The prices charged by the hotel on the top were beyond anything known even in American hotels, and the consequence is, that no one stays more than a night. An entirely new company appears every day.

From the White Mountains we passed, Canada-wards, through the State of Maine. It is not a rich State; the soil is very gravelly; and, besides agriculture, the chief industries of the State are connected with the lumber (or timber) trade, and the fishings along the coast. Naturally, we were interested in the Maine liquor-law question. We had observed in the newspapers a controversy respecting the influence of prohibition on the habits of the people. A name we have been accustomed to honour—that of Dr. Leonard Bacon, formerly President of Yale College—had appeared among the opponents of prohibition, while that of Mr. Neal Dow was conspicuous in its defence. I frankly admit that, in the State itself, I had neither time nor opportunity to form an opinion of any direct value. It was rather from conversation with trustworthy friends, not prejudiced on either side, that I formed my conclusion. It seems impossible to doubt that drink finds its way into Maine, and that a good deal is consumed. In other words, the law is often evaded. But it appears equally certain that, on the whole, prohibition has led to a great improvement. From the fact that many of its people are employed as lumber-men and fishers,—occupations which involve much exposure to weather and water,—intemperance used to be common in Maine; now, people are proverbially sober. At the same time, as we have said, drink finds its way among some of them, and then it is generally abused. Probably this amount of improvement is all that it would be reasonable to look for, because no law is quite independent of public opinion, and where a law is unpopular, men will disregard it. Take it all in all, there seems little doubt that prohibition has been a boon to Maine.

There is abundant evidence that, in general society, and especially in Christian society, the habitual use of liquor at table is much less prevalent than in Britain. No one will doubt that this is true of Christian society, and in regard to society of a more mixed character, there are decisive facts patent to all. In the great hotels, amid a more than sufficient profusion and variety of food, there is hardly such a thing to be seen as a bottle of wine. Masses of people who can afford to pay four dollars a-day for board, content themselves with water as a beverage. No doubt, there is the bar somewhere in the hotel, where gentlemen inclined to drink may find all they desire; but no lady is ever seen in such a place. There is no trace of the sentiment that strong drink is indispensable as an ordinary beverage. It is this powerful but unreasonable sentiment, as it appears to us, that needs to be broken down in Great Britain. On the western side of the Atlantic, men in high position give entertainments on the abstinence principle. President Hayes has never given wine at his banquets; and in Canada, Sir Charles Tupper, a leading public man, acts on the same principle. Whatever may be thought of their example, it at least bears out our remark as to the sentiment in America in regard to strong drink as a habitual beverage. But the fact that, in spite of this, there is much drinking and much drunkenness in the country, and that many a horrible crime is committed under the influence of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

intoxication, shows, that even a high example has but a limited influence, and that many other forces must combine ere intemperance is numbered among things that have been.

W. G. B.

GENERAL SURVEY.

ENGLAND.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE excitement about the Burials Bill cannot be said to have ceased, even now that it has passed both Houses of Parliament. It passed without the Lords' amendments. And more than that, a great stress was laid upon the clause containing a sort of parliamentary recognition of Convocation, which, though its proceedings sometimes fill pages of the *Guardian*, has no real synodical power. This proposed clause sweetened the bitter morsel to many High Churchmen. When the Dissenters and some Low Churchmen intimated a determined opposition, the *Guardian* even lost its equanimity, and uttered ominous warnings, but in vain. The "Convocation" solace was given up, and the wrath no doubt is great.

Disappointed in not getting a religious census after its mind, the *Guardian* has been trying its hand at ecclesiastical statistics. According to the census of 1851, the Nonconformists had 5000 more places of worship than the Establishment. The defenders of the Church will not take this in; it is, they affirm, a mere "statistical hoax." "In reality," says the *Guardian*, "instead of 20,000 places of worship thirty years ago, Dissent has even now only a little over 8000." This seems startling, but still more startling is the method of proof. It is admitted that there are 20,000 dissenting places of worship "registered," but of these only 8400 are registered for marriages,—a clear indication, it is argued, that the other 11,000 are shams, having no sort of right to be designated chapels. But even if the outcast 11,000 were only schools or halls, they might have a million worshippers Sabbath after Sabbath. The *Nonconformist* declines to admit any justice in the *Guardian's* way of putting the matter, and points out that, on the "very forefront" of the official returns from which it quotes, there is an intimation given that the list is imperfect; and, in fact, it does not include some of the largest and best known chapels in the metropolis, such as Dr. Allon's, the Weigh House, Finsbury Chapel, &c.

In the *Nonconformist* of 2nd September, there is a letter from a Methodist superintendent stating that he has ten chapels in his circuit, only two of which are licensed for marriages, though all the rest are "substantial buildings settled on trust-deeds." At the Conference of one of the Dissentient Methodist Communion the number of communal chapels was stated at 4000; while there were other chapels and rooms with religious services in them to the number of nearly 2000. The *Guardian*, however, thought to clinch the matter by a specific case. Taking the county of Kent (where the Church is strong), it made out, by its peculiar logic, that there the Establishment provides 527 churches to the Nonconformist 240 chapels. Then, condescending to particulars, it assigned sixty-six places of worship to the Independents. But the *Nonconformist* was able to show, in this case, how incomplete and fallacious is the registered list of sacred buildings, by giving the locality and capacity, not of sixty-six, but of 126 Independent places of worship in Kent, with sittings varying from 150 to 1200, the average being about 460.

The subject of Patronage is beginning to be very seriously discussed in the Church of England. Enormous scandals are being disclosed. The evidence given

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

before the Lords' Committee shows the prevalence of a horrible system of Simony, and of something very like perjury among the English clergy. In another aspect, the Patronage question is coming to the front. The stir has been chiefly created by the presentation to the principal charge at Bournemouth, one of the most powerful and wealthy High Church congregations in the kingdom, of a very pronounced Evangelical. The most strenuous opposition has been raised, but the patron has stood firm to his rights; and it seems as if the great work done by the late minister, a man of extraordinary energy, were to be cast to the winds.

NONCONFORMISTS.

THE Autumn Meeting of the Congregational Union takes place at Manchester on the 11th October. Papers on important subjects are to be read. An afternoon is to be devoted to a matter which is at present greatly exercising English Non-conformists—"The best mode of promoting lay preaching." The chief interest, however, of the meeting is in connection with the Union's Jubilee in 1881. That apparently is to be made a sort of Pan-Congregational Congress. Resolutions are to be proposed "with a view to securing representatives from the United States and the Colonies," and also in regard to raising a special Jubilee Fund in behalf of the "Church Aid and Home Missionary Society."

The Wesleyans are evidently in much concern regarding the diminution of their numbers. It is all the more serious that not merely the great parent body is decreasing, but some of the more considerable Methodist communions which have separated from it. The Primitive Methodists report a decrease of 171 last year, and of 186 this year. The United Methodist Free Churches have 260 fewer members this year than last. Singularly enough, we may notice that things look better with the small body of "Bible Christian Methodists," who have added during the year 671 to their numbers. We learn from an American Methodist newspaper, that in middle Tennessee there are two Methodist Conferences—the Episcopal Conference, one of the oldest in the United States, and the African Episcopal Methodist Conference, which has only existed a dozen years. The former seems to be almost at a stand—the latter is brisk and prospering. The older communion added last year scarcely one per cent. to its membership, the younger and far less influential communion added more than twenty per cent. The latter—greatly poorer, we may well believe, than its neighbour—contributes for all Church purposes a dollar more per annum. The meaning no doubt is that in the case of progress and success you have more of the fervour and aggressiveness of early Methodism, and a suitable field for their action. The faith and fire of other days, with the same elements to work on, would still have ample fruits. But neither is the aggressive power of English Methodism what it has been, nor is the field of operation in England the same as it was, either in extent or character.

SCOTLAND.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES IN SCOTLAND.

It would seem as if a day of trial were coming upon all the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland. The case of Mr. Macrae in the United Presbyterian Church, and that of Professor Smith in the Free Church, are well known. Now the Established Church is threatened with trouble. The volume of sermons by some of its ministers has been formally brought under the notice of the Presbytery of Glasgow (a member of which is one of the writers), with respect to its orthodoxy. The subject is to be considered at next meeting of Presbytery.

The Free Church Presbytery of Aberdeen has just ordained an additional missionary to labour in China, in connection with the English Presbyterian Church. "This is the jubilee year of the native church under my charge," writes the minister of the Free Native Church in Bombay. It is a suggestive

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

fact in the history of modern missions, though not altogether encouraging, for after half-a-century the numerical results are not great. But it is not by conversions in units, or in tens, that these great systems of Oriental superstition are to be overthrown. They will probably hold well together till all is ready for a great and widespread collapse.

The missionaries of the United Presbyterian Church in India are greatly impressed with the importance of having an agency of native medical men and women. Dr. Valentine has for some time been working earnestly in this direction. His plan is to have an institution for fifty native boarders at Agra, where there is a medical school under a medical superintendent and his wife. A property has already been secured, and a considerable sum has been raised as a partial endowment. All that is wanted now to set agoing what seems to us one of the most hopeful plans of missionary effort, is a few annual contributions from missionary societies. We can hardly overestimate the blessed results, in many ways, of well-trained Christian medical women in the zenanas of India.

A very notable minister of the United Presbyterian Church, the Rev. Dr. William Marshall, of Coupar-Angus, has recently passed away. His ministry has been a long one, and during nearly the whole course of it he was very prominent in the affairs of his Church. In the various important doctrinal and ecclesiastical discussions of the last forty years he took an active part. A man of "combat," he was at the same time generous and kindly; and though a strong Calvinist, he preached the Gospel with the fulness and freeness of a disciple of the Marrow-men.

HOLLAND.

By the Rev. Prof. PH. J. HOEDEMAEKER, D.D.

THE articles regulating the admission of members to the National Church of Holland were modified by its Synod in 1879, with a view to smooth the way for the adherents of the Liberals (Unitarians) and the Moderns (Naturalists). In consequence of this change, the greatest excitement prevailed throughout the churches, and a disruption, or at least a new secession, seemed unavoidable.

Up to that time, candidates had been examined by the pastor in the presence of one or two elders, with regard to the knowledge they possessed of Scripture, the Catechism, morals, and Church history. If the result of this inquiry was satisfactory, a *profession of faith* was demanded. The admission itself, or confirmation, took place, if no objection was raised, at a special service, where, amongst others, the following question was put and answered: "Do you profess to believe in God the Father, the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son, our Lord, and in the Holy Ghost?" The new article, briefly stated, read as follows:—

The examination as regards the knowledge possessed by the candidate, is so conducted that *THE OPPORTUNITY is given to make a profession of his Christian faith*. If the knowledge is deemed insufficient he is not admitted. *Objections made with regard to his religious convictions afford no ground for rejection, if he declares himself ready to answer the questions to be put at the confirmation.*

Hence, the modification amounted to something like this, that while, formerly, the pastor and the elders could exercise their own judgment as to what ought to be considered "a profession of faith," now, all private judgment is put out of the question, while the profession of faith is limited to the statement, "I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," which the Moderns, as well as the Arians, explain in accordance with their theories.

But even this was not enough. For the article regulating the confirmation of candidates, which had previously contained the formula of the questions to be answered at the special service above mentioned, was henceforth to read thus:—"The following questions will be proposed to the new members, *as far as their spirit and principal contents are concerned.*"

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1850.]

The significance of these changes will be more manifest if we look at the relative positions, on the one hand, of the heterodox party, favoured by the higher authorities of the Church, and the orthodox consistories on the other.

The Synod, it must be understood, is a small ecclesiastical body or court created by the Civil Government, immediately after the anarchy of the Revolution, to take charge of the government of the Church, as well as to maintain its faith. Since that time, indeed, it has been put beyond Government control, invested with full legislative and executive powers, and elected in a manner by the Church, though neither the congregations nor the Classes (Presbyteries), but only small courts or committees of men in each province have anything to do with the election; nevertheless the article of the Constitution which demands *the maintenance of the faith laid down in the symbols of the Church* remains intact till the present day. From the first moment of its existence, however, it has not only tolerated but maintained heresy in its various forms, by a system of prevarication, temporising, and sophistry, really sickening to think of, doing its utmost to prevent a disruption, or to violate the letter of the constitution in such a way that a verdict could not be obtained against it in the civil courts of justice.

Till lately, this system was continued for two reasons. The Evangelical party was in the minority, and had to confine itself to petition and protest. And furthermore, it took a position with regard to the Confession which rendered it entirely powerless against the encroachments of the Synod. Discarding the Confession of Faith, *taken literally*, as the basis of ecclesiastical communion, it fell back upon "the spirit of the Confession," which was logically the very same ground the heterodox took in their opposition against the principal doctrines of the Church. Of late, however, the consistories of the larger cities have changed their character. The places are mainly filled by Evangelical men, who hastened to put a stop to the progress of "Liberalism" in the Church by the rejection of candidates whose profession of faith was in overt opposition to the doctrines of grace. At the same time, the so-called "Reformed party," which is daily gaining influence, placed itself on the basis of the Confession, taking the ground that it is not for the individual, but for the Church itself, represented by a Synod or Assembly properly so called, to make any alteration, if necessary, in the symbol of faith. Hence a powerful movement was set on foot by the Rationalists, to obtain a clearer title to their right in the Church. Of this movement, the alteration of the articles above stated is the result. It is directed against the orthodox consistories, with the view of making mere puppets of the elders, and compelling them to admit those who are not sound in the faith. More than 200 congregations immediately notified the Synod that they considered the change as non-existent, and would act accordingly.

It seems to me, however (although this is not the general opinion of our coadjutors), that the opposition was crippled from the first by the refusal of elders to assist at the examination of candidates, whenever the ministers declared that they placed themselves on the basis of the new articles. After this notification, these ministers supplied themselves with elders in accordance with their own views, in a few cases accepting even those who served the Church formerly in that capacity. Consequently, the conflicts were very few.

At Dordt, only the orthodox elders and ministers were, for the most part, suspended, but they proceeded with their functions, refusing to surrender the minutes of the consistory, &c. In short, a state of anarchy prevailed which seemed to threaten the Church in its very existence. At present, however, there is a lull in the storms which have been raging. It is more than probable that the Synod, ever fruitful in expedients to continue the *status quo*, will publish a sort of indemnity-bill, exchanging the prisoners and cancelling the misdemeanours on both sides.

Several radical measures were proposed by the Rationalists, such as — "To change the article in the constitution which makes the maintenance of the orthodox faith the end which all ecclesiastical courts are to have in view;" "To

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

allow the minorities in our large cities a representation in the ministry and the eldership, according to the relative number of votes brought out by them," &c. On some of the motions, a final vote has not yet been taken. But from what has transpired, it is more than probable that the Synod will use all its generalship in making an attempt to cripple the opposition directly, to favour the Rationalists indirectly, and to temporise if there is any possibility of doing so.

Of course, this state of things cannot continue any great length of time. But it is impossible to say when the crisis will come or what the final result will be.

I am sorry to say the Evangelical party is far from united, with regard to the mode of attack or defence. This strengthens the Synod, of course, and may prove our ruin, unless God in His mercy prevents. Some wish to temporise until the needful majorities are gained in the provincial committees, so as to give us an orthodox Synod. They are opposed to what they call extreme measures, which tend to force the Rationalists to desperation, and the Synod to a sudden and decisive step. Others are in favour of a peaceful separation, and consequent division of the Church. Others, again, maintain the autonomy of individual congregations, including the right to secede as such.

The relative position of the Reformed and the Evangelical parties at large has been referred to above. By comparing the statement made by us, with what Prof. Van Oosterzee took the liberty of saying at Basel, according to the report of his speech which was translated for *The Catholic Presbyterian*,* the exact difference may be gauged.

We could almost wish for extreme measures on the part of the Synod. Nothing would better tend to unite than the sense of a common danger and a common cause. Still, it is best to follow the leading of Providence.

In the meanwhile, there is a great deal of missionary work done by the pastors as well as the people, in the mission halls, the Sabbath schools, by house-to-house visitation, and last, not least, the free Christian school. This last is to some extent characteristic of Holland. The Liberal party in the state uses the secular, or so-called neutral school, as an engine against the truth. The neutrality it pleads for is, as a general rule, an empty name. And in the cause of education the Christians of Holland are almost a unit in their opposition to the Government system. They pay their heavy school taxes and support their own schools besides. In this matter, the churches, though weakened by the existence of Rationalism, are trying to do their duty. Last year, a bill passed our legislature, in spite of the remonstrance of 450,000 Christians who petitioned the King not to sign it, which tends to make competition with the Government school nearly an impossibility. But instead of discouraging, it has only roused to greater effort.

Of the Free University, mention was made in last number (see p. 228). It is to be opened at Amsterdam in the month of October. But the position which it occupies in relation to the Confession of our faith is a drawback to a more extensive sympathy. Still, as this is the only definite, tangible, and firm position to occupy—a fact which is more and more recognised,—it must, after its time of struggle and trial, succeed in the end.

PRUSSIA.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS.

By Professor WITTE, *Pforta*.

It has become a common saying that the German Reformation originated the German primary schools (*Volksschulen*—i.e., schools for the people). This was the case, however, only indirectly. The mighty impulse which Luther and Melancthon and their friends gave to the education of the people was chiefly in the direction of the institution of town schools for higher education, based on a knowledge of the Latin language. In the year 1524, Luther loudly called on all burgomasters and

* No. XII., for December, 1879, p. 401, ff.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

councillors of all the towns in the German lands to establish Christian schools. He earnestly entreated all his "dear Germans" before all things to seek, at whatever cost, the best education for their children. But his view was specially directed to the organisation of town schools for the purpose of training pious preachers and public servants, and therefore he laid particular emphasis on the study of the ancient languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. The ancient languages are the sheath of the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, the shrine of this jewel, the vessel containing this living water; because these languages were again studied, the Gospel was again unfolded clearly and purely, almost as in the days of the Apostles; again the sun itself shone forth, and in comparison with these times the days of the old Church Fathers were as darkness. Luther's influence and his writings in diverse ways led to the founding of such Latin schools. But the education of the common people, of peasants, workmen, servants, and servant-girls, for whom the later elementary schools were instituted, was not at all in the view of Luther or of his times. Meanwhile, the great Reformer prepared his German translation of the Bible and his Shorter Catechism, and put them into the hands of the German people. Here we have certainly the point of crystallisation around which, in course of time, the whole system of the German Volksschulen has gathered.

For the first time in the seventeenth century we find the treasures, won for the common people by the Reformation, placed within their reach in the public schools. That the sextons were required to train the boys and girls of the village congregations as well as the domestic servants in the Catechism and in church music, was a regulation already in force, as appears from certain church-visitation orders of the Reformation century. Yet it was the great Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William II., who first, in 1662, enjoined that the churches and the communities should, with all industry, here and there, in villages and rural districts as well as in towns, set about the erection of well-appointed schools. This injunction, however, was carried out only to a very limited extent, for the Thirty Years' War had made the land desolate, and reduced the people to poverty.

For the first time the iron, stern, frugal father of Frederick the Great, King Frederick William I., the true creator of the Prussian State, laid here also the foundation on which his more famous son further built. He concerned himself with—(1.) Institutions in which teachers were trained for the people's schools; and (2.), he established, by orders issued in 1717 and 1736, the principle of the necessity of a general school education, and to this the Prussian and German people of all classes owe the privileges of education now enjoyed by the nation. How necessary the first measure was, appears from the Rescripts of 1722 and 1738, in which it is declared "that no other workmen except tailors, linen-weavers, smiths, wheelwrights, and carpenters should be employed in the lowlands as sextons and schoolmasters," and "that in the lowlands no other tailors should be permitted in the same village except the sexton and the schoolmaster." Thus, workmen and discharged soldiers had the management of schools entrusted to them, and this state of things continued for a long time, and all through the last century. In the year 1789, the well-known evangelical bishop Borowski writes: "On the whole, the Prussian village-school system is putting on a more favourable appearance, and I have nowhere in my journeys found better education given. As in thirteen years I had to visit some seventy of these country schools, I have been often astonished at the amount of work that can be done in them, and that by tradesmen and invalids, when they have a naturally good understanding, and an aptitude for the work, and receive some direction from the pastor of the place."

The true birth-day of the Prussian primary-school system was that on which Frederick II., immediately after his great wars, published the "General National-School *Reglement*" for the whole kingdom, the 12th August, 1763. How near the heart of the great monarch lay the subject of the establishment of public schools in his kingdom appears from the fact, that seven days before the conclusion

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

of the Peace of Hubertsburger, 8th February, 1763, he had already given directions regarding the preparation of that decree. This *reglement* of Frederick II. in 1763 is, to the present day, the foundation of the whole Prussian school-system, and in connection with the "culture-war" (*Culturkampf*), has not failed during the last ten years to encounter the violent assaults of liberalism. It is noteworthy that the king, though well-known to have been a "free-thinker," yet knew and would acknowledge no other foundation for the schools of his country than the pure Gospel of the Word of God. Every school day begins with the singing of a hymn and prayer, and the first hour of school instruction is devoted to the subject of religion, partly Bible history and partly the Catechism. In the 17th section of his Decree, Frederick II. earnestly inculcates on every teacher the following rules:—"As regards the work of the school itself, sextons and schoolmasters are hereby earnestly admonished above all things to prepare themselves for imparting instruction by hearty prayer, and by entreating the Giver of all good gifts to bestow His divine blessing on their work, and wisdom and patience in it. Especially they ought to pray the Lord to endow them with a paternal affection toward the children entrusted to them, and an earnest interest in their welfare, tempered by love, in order that they might discharge all the duties devolving on them as teachers willingly and without angry feelings, remembering that without the divine help of Jesus Christ, the Great Friend of children, and of His Spirit, they can do nothing aright, and are not able to win the hearts of the children. They have need to pray from the bottom of their hearts, not only that they may be helped, in communicating instruction, to do so with a calm and composed mind, but also that God would bless their endeavours, and grant from above His gracious favour to rest on this planting and watering, because all that is truly good can only come by the grace of God, and by the operation of His Spirit in the children." Pastors and superintendents were, by this decree, expressly appointed by virtue of their office to act as local and district inspectors of the schools, and thus the schools were bound in the closest manner to the Church.

In this spirit, all the successors of Frederick on the throne have cared for and fostered the elementary schools of the country. In the year 1818 there was instituted, for the whole monarchy, a "Ministry of Instruction." Previously, the schools were under the direction and control of the Church-consistories; in 1787 they were placed under an "Upper School *Collegium*;" then under the "Ministry of Justice;" and since the promulgation of Stein's law, in 1807, under a section of the "Ministry of the Interior."

The serious, pious spirit in which the Prussian schools were managed, found, at length, an official expression in the so-called three Prussian "Regulations" of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd October, 1854, of the Minister Von Raumer—regulations which have been much opposed, but which breathed an excellent spirit, as they were the fruit of a really pedagogic experience. Concentration and depth of instruction,—not the knowledge of many things, but an intelligent preparation of the scholar for the duties of life in the Church and family, in his worldly calling, in the community, and in the State; the relation of the entire education to the central point of the child's life, religion—these are the leading, fundamental principles of the "Regulations" by Von Raumer.

The whole Rationalism and Naturalism of the German press broke out with one accord against these regulations as soon as they were published. The subject was also brought by petition before Parliament, and the non-execution of the hated resolutions was keenly discussed. Under the leadership, however, of the Old-Liberal, subsequently Minister of Instruction, Von Bethmann-Hollweg, the commission appointed to inquire into the matter declared the principle embodied in the regulations to be true, and in the highest degree worthy of recognition. But the real author of the regulations, Privy Councillor Stiehl, showed that they really contained nothing new, but were an actual continuation of the old-school system presented in a distinct and combined form as it had been legally established in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

Prussia. Thus the regulations were carried out in all the provinces, and for eighteen years had legal authority.

Raumer's successor as Minister of Instruction, Von Mühler, carried out the principles of his predecessor in the management of his public schools. But lamentable inconsistencies on his part, as well as the Liberal tendency of the times, led to Mühler's fall on the 17th January, 1872, and on 22nd of the same month, Dr. Falk succeeded to his office. Already, however, the "Culturkampf," to the unreserved management of which Falk had been called, and which led to the withdrawal of the "Catholic participation" in the "ministry of worship," had led to a proposal regarding the schools being brought before the Prussian Parliament, which Falk carried through, and which inflicted a fatal wound on the old Prussian tradition regarding the relations subsisting between the Church and the school. We lament the passing of this so-called "School-inspection law" of 11th March, 1872. In order to remove the Catholic priest from the inspection of the schools, the whole of the Evangelical pastors and superintendents, who had hitherto, by virtue of their ecclesiastical offices, *eo ipso*, discharged the duties of inspectors, were, with one stroke of the pen, deprived of their offices "for the sake of confessional parity."

On the 15th October, 1872, the Minister Falk rescinded the school regulations of 1854, and substituted in their place the so-called "General decisions regarding the organisation, function, and aim of the Prussian Primary Schools." These correspond in number and distribution to Raumer's three regulations. For elementary schools, one hour of religious instruction was withdrawn; and regarding instruction in the Catechism, it was ordained that the two last sections of Luther's Catechism should be eliminated from the school. But for the seminaries for teachers, it was ordered that the lowest class should have only four hours' religious instruction each week, the middle class only three, and the highest only two. So much the more time was given to the training of the future young teachers in the *realia*, and on these subjects also, for elementary schools, a disproportionate stress was laid. Moreover, the 26th section of the General Regulations for School Lesson-Books set forth that when the schools were attended by children of different creeds, only such lesson-books were, if possible, to be chosen as had no distinct denominational character. The parts of such books already introduced that contained anything denominational were to be set aside.

By these decisions, the way was essentially prepared for the introduction of an institution which corresponded to the confessionless features of the times—the so-called *Simultan* school. Thus sprang up, like mushrooms, school-books in which history, as well as the other contents, presented nothing that could give offence to Catholics or Protestants. What kind of view, *e.g.*, the children of Evangelical parents could possibly receive from such books, regarding the German Reformation, of Luther, and Melancthon, of the Thirty Years' War, with its Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus, the reader can easily imagine.

By the Ministerial directions of the 21st April and 11th September, 1873, it was explained that in those districts of the country where the population adhered to different Confessions, the best means for meeting the necessities of all, and of bringing about harmony, would be the removal of hitherto separate confessional schools, and the establishment in their room of *Simultan* schools. These directions were to be carried out only when the necessities and circumstances of the cases permitted.

Thus the *parole* was given, of which the whole political and ecclesiastical Liberalism took hold, in order to get rid of the hated "Confession" altogether. The fire of the burning "Culturkampf" was now stirred up into a violent heat; and after the seven years of Falk's government, there existed in Prussia no fewer than 442 *Simultan* schools, of which there existed before only 60.

From all this it appears that the name *Simultan* school, or *Parität* school, is only a somewhat better-sounding designation for that which is more definitely called a Confessionless school. The *Simultan* schools in reality banish every religious

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

creed from their instruction. The scholars, however, according to their own wish, may have an hour for religious instruction, given by the pastor of their own Confession, within the school premises. The teachers are required during school hours carefully to avoid every confessional allusion.

The history of the Word must be taught so as to touch upon no Confession. Woe to the teacher who suffers himself to make any ambiguous remarks about the Pope, or to say anything in the way of approbation of the Reformation. There are also Jewish children in the school, and therefore no word must be uttered regarding the fact that the judgment of God has fallen upon Israel, because they crucified Jesus Christ the Son of God. The noble German choral song which, on the battle-field of the Thirty Years' War, of the Seven Years' War, and of the last French war, kindled within the hearts of evangelical soldiers, from all corners of the land, emotions of thanks and praise to God, and the evangelical precious hymn, must all be heard no longer in the schools, because they are so confessional! The lesson-books are colourless and tame in their contents; the pious teacher must every moment be on his guard lest his mouth should utter thoughts with which his heart is full. But above all, religion, which till now has been the very heart and kernel and guiding star of the whole system of instruction in the German Volksschule, now sinks down to the rank of a mere subject or department along with others; and since it is attended to only by-the-by, and not as a subject entrusted to the teacher of the school, it must live in the consciences of the children only as a subordinate subject, and in course of time it will come about—a result which is contemplated by many of the advocates of *Parität* schools, and which is, indeed, the final issue of the system—that confessionless schools will become schools without any religion, as is seen in Holland, to the serious injury of that country, and also in France, at the present day.

But not to speak of other objections to such a system, the object aimed at by confessionless schools—viz, the promotion of confessional harmony—has not at all been attained. Nowhere has so much controversy and direct strife been awakened as just in those places where the Simultan schools have been established. The abundant resources of Rome, besides, make it always possible that separate Roman Catholic private schools will be established. The hitherto evangelical State schools will then, however, have lost religious instruction; and here also, as in the entire Culturkampf, it is the Evangelical Church which comes out of the conflict dishonoured and most deeply wounded.

The entire institution of Simultan schools has been called into existence to gain an end in connection with the Culturkampf. Two brochures which have recently appeared, openly and distinctly affirm that "it is the function of the Simultan schools to bring to an end the Culturkampf in favour of the State." "The Simultan school is the most powerful agent in the Culturkampf." We thank God that the new Minister of Instruction, Von Puttkamen, has arrested the pressure in the direction of Simultanising the Prussian schools. May it be granted to him and to the man by whose advice aged King William raised him to the ministry, Prince Bismarck, to put an end to the sad Culturkampf in such a way that the State, in opposition to the excessive demands of Rome, may preserve her rights, but also that the Evangelical Church may again hold among the people that place of esteem and of spiritual power by which alone the Prussian State has risen to that height of greatness it has now attained!

HUNGARY.

THE JEWS IN HUNGARY.

THE Hungarian Ministry of Worship and Instruction has just published a detailed report of the whole educational state of Hungary during the school year 1878-79, from which we learn, among other things, that though the entire Jewish population of Hungary is only 550,000 out of a total of 13,576,480 souls, yet it furnishes

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

a predominant proportion of pupils to all the different classes of schools. This is found to be the case also in continental countries generally, and has of late arrested considerable attention. There are some of the gymnasia in Hungary where three-fourths of the entire pupils attending them are Israelites, and in others there are certain classes which are under the necessity of observing the Jewish feast-days, because they are almost wholly made up of Jews. In the gymnasia generally throughout the kingdom, they furnish 18 per cent. of the pupils, in the "Real-schools," 36 per cent., and in the faculty of law, 25 per cent. In commenting on these facts, the *Allgem. Evang.-Luth. Kirchen-Ztg.*, has the following remarks:—"Considering that the Jews constitute only 4 per cent. of the whole population, this is a proportion which not only proves the vigorous activity of this people, but also points to an educated proletariat, which, though trained intellectually, is not yet trained morally, and therefore can scarcely be a blessing. It is also noteworthy that it has never once occurred to the Jews, abounding as they do in wealth, to establish any middle class-schools; and when the Minister of Instruction, during the last school-year, was under the necessity, in consequence of the unusual number of Jewish children seeking admission, of opening a separate course of instruction, though only provisionally, for those first-year pupils at the gymnasia who did not find room in the existing schools, there arose a loud and bitter complaint among the Jews that their children were treated as pariahs, and that they were to be separately taught, Getto-like! Thus with them there must be no isolation, but yet also no assimilation,—at most an absorbing of Christian funds in order that by this means, and by the sciences taught in Christian schools, they may wage war against Christian philosophy."

SPAIN.

By the Rev. JOHN JAMESON, Madrid.

I HAVE hitherto been more than content to let Messrs. Duncan and Flidner tell the story of the progress of Spanish Evangelisation to the respected readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian*; and when I now take up the pen, it is only because I have been witness to some recent incidents which serve to prove the vitality of the work done by our pioneers, the colporteurs of the Bible Societies. As director in Spain of the National Bible Society of Scotland's colporteurs, and also as missionary of the United Presbyterian Church, I have had the honour of assisting in the formation of two new congregations, one in the province of Salamanca, and the other in that of Toledo, which may be fairly taken as typical examples of what is being done and might be done without limit, were our home Churches only in a position to afford us the necessary means. In both cases, the evangelical movement has been directly the result of colportage. In the village in the province of Toledo, the colporteur, on visiting from house to house, found three or four men who had long been secretly favourable to the Gospel, and who had studied their Bibles, but had never dared openly to declare their opinions. They each suggested two or three others as likely to be sympathisers, but without being certain of the fact. The colporteur induced them to meet together, and promised to visit them from time to time. Their meetings and his visits could not be long kept secret, and in a short time, whenever he returned to the place, he had an audience numbering from 50 to 100. At length, about last Christmastide, thirty-four were found willing to declare themselves on the Lord's side. Among them were several who, even at that early stage of their spiritual history, were shining examples of the effect of divine grace in their changed lives.

But the organising of the little congregation was the signal for the outbreak of Popish intolerance and persecution. The priests have no great objections to their parishioners holding any kind of doctrines, or even absenting themselves altogether from the sacraments, so long as they are content to be separate and unorganised; but as soon as some two or three come together and begin to hold

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

their little meetings, these assemblies are considered a danger to society which must be put down at all hazards. The parish priest of M—— did not consider himself quite able to cope with the evangelicals, so he summoned to his aid several of the clergy of Toledo, from which the village is about six miles distant; and a week's services were held in which all the stale calumnies against Luther and the Reformation were retailed, but without great effect on the congregation, and with absolutely none on the evangelicals. Private conferences were then tried, and one by one the recent converts were called to the priest's house, and interrogated, cajoled, and threatened, but equally without effect. To finish up, the Jesuit missionary who had been the principal preacher ventured to hold a conference with the colporteur in the house of one of the principal men of the village, who is a friend to the movement; but the result was very disastrous for his reverence. He was so hard pressed by the simple questions and statements of the colporteur, that he rose up in haste, saying to his companions, "Come along, come along; there is nothing to be gained by treating with these heretics." Since then, the evangelicals of M—— have been free from public molestation, except once, when the arrival of the colporteur was made the occasion of a great riot on the part of the women and boys. But quiet and persistent family persecution is unceasing, trying to the utmost the patience and tempers of the converts. By the grace of God, however, they have been able to stand fast, and the work goes on silently, deepening and widening. Several neighbouring villages, and Toledo itself, have groups, more or less considerable, of inquirers who would at once form the nuclei of congregations, were there any one to send to the district as an evangelist.

The movement in the province of Salamanca has been, if possible, more spontaneous. That in the town of Salamanca owed its origin directly to the work of a colporteur and a Bible-woman, and a compact little congregation of about thirty members is now gathered there. But in V——, a village about six leagues distant, the movement has resulted from the efforts of a young man of the place, who had bought a New Testament more from curiosity than anything else. He very soon discovered its excellence, and, calling in his friends and neighbours, made them acquainted with the prize he had found. A little group of inquiring Christians was formed, and they sent to the pastor of Salamanca, asking him to come and preach to them. The distance on these wind-blown plains of Castille is long, and the journey tedious; but the good pastor has gone backwards and forwards to V—— from Salamanca many times, nothing daunted by wind, rain, and snow; and now there is in V—— a healthy little congregation of about thirty members. They are perhaps the most satisfactory Christians in any part of Spain, emulating the noble Bereans in their diligent searching of the Scriptures. Each man carries his little Testament continually about with him; and when resting from work in the field, or plodding along the roads at the side of his cart or laden mule, he is occupied with words of Holy Writ. Their love of the Bible is quite a notable feature of these Christians; and in public worship a welcome sight is the almost universal production of the Book—not too common a feature, unfortunately, in other congregations in Spain.

In both these villages the Christians possess their little chapels,—a necessity arising from the existing law, which makes it very difficult to obtain permission for public meetings, but which puts no obstacles in the way of the opening of houses specially dedicated to Protestant worship. In both, too, the members have provided themselves with cemeteries, as this is one of the great difficulties the poor people find on making a profession of Protestantism. There is no place where they can be decently buried, should they die; and a case has occurred in which a body had to be interred in a field, and left to the mercy of any impious wretch, who, in his fanatical rage, might thirst to violate the last resting-place of the despised heretic.

To those who have any acquaintance with Spain, it is a most significant fact that a movement has begun in these provinces of Toledo and Salamanca, the two

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, October, 1880.]

most signalised for their obedience to Rome,—the former being the actual centre of the hierarchy in Spain, and the latter bound to the Church of Rome by ages of glorious traditions.

It is my firm belief that in many other towns and villages there are hidden Christians, the fruit of colportage, who only need the encouragement arising from the presence of an evangelist or pastor, to come out and openly associate themselves as evangelical Christians. And it has long been my conviction that our Churches, as such, should more actively follow up and try to develop the work begun by the colporteur. Had this been done from the first, we should doubtless be able to show a very different state of things to-day in Spain.

I have only to add that our little Spanish Christian Church held its Synod or General Assembly in Madrid in the end of May. Seventeen churches (congregations) and mission stations were represented on that occasion. Readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian* are already aware of the attempt which has been made by a former pastor of our Church (once the apparently strenuous supporter of Presbytery himself,—indeed, the founder of the present system in Spain) to introduce Prelacy, and to discredit the organisation and efficiency of the Spanish Christian Church. The Assembly is the best answer to his allegations; and although very far from perfect, it contains all the elements necessary for a successful Mission Church. The unanimity and cordiality of the pastors, both native and foreign, were most encouraging, and led some of us to wonder if the recent secession were not, after all, an unspeakable benefit to the whole Church.

ITALY.

By the Rev. AUGUST MEILLE, Florence.

ALL foreign visitors to Florence will doubtless remember the beautiful Protestant cemetery, outside the Porta Pinti. For the last fifty years it was the resting-place of all Protestants, whether foreign or native, who died in Florence, except the very poor who received gratuitous burial, at the expense of the town, in a filthy compartment of the Communal cemetery of Trespiano on the Bologna road. In the cemetery of Porta Pinti many illustrious strangers are buried: the poetess Elizabeth Barrett-Browning, Theodore Parker, and several English and American sculptors and artists. Here also lies our great Italian controversialist, Dr. Luigi Desanctis, who, after being a parish priest in Rome, ended his days as a Professor of our School of Divinity in Florence. That old cemetery is now closed, but it is to be preserved as a beautiful ornament to that part of the town, and a new one, three times as large, has been opened in a very beautiful situation—amongst the hills at the south of Florence, one mile from the city. The little chapel attached to the cemetery was recently opened, and the ceremony attracted a very large and mixed audience. That cemetery was built at the expense of all the Florence churches, and is open to all Protestants, of every denomination or class of society. The poor receive gratuitous burial, and the rich may erect here the most costly monuments. I mention this because the opening of that large and beautiful cemetery has produced a very favourable impression on the Florentine public, who did not think the Protestant community so numerous as to require such an extensive burying-ground. Now an English gentleman, Mr. Archibald Dennistoun, has offered a sum of £500 to erect in the middle of it a granite column bearing aloft a beautiful marble cross. To us it means nothing; but it says to the Roman Catholic population of Florence that this is a Christian cemetery, and that those who use it profess to have been redeemed by the Cross of Jesus Christ.